UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 161 205 2 9

Ex Libris
C. K. OGDEN

ESTC

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/twodissertations00musg

TWO DISSERTATIONS.

I. ON THE GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY.

II. AN EXAMINATION OF Sir ISAAC NEWTON'S Objections to the CHRONOLOGY of the OLYMPIADS.

BY THE LATE

SAMUEL MUSGRAVE, M.D. F.R.S.

LONDON,

PRINTED BY J. NICHOLS.

MDCCLXXXII.

BL
750
M972t

ADVERTISEMENT.

THOUGH many of the moſt liberal Subſcribers in the following liſt have ſignified an intention of requiring only one copy, it has been thought proper to do juſtice to their generoſity, by ſetting down the full amount of each ſubſcription.

1003549

The Names of the SUBSCRIBERS.

A.

Mr. Abbot, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. Abbott, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. J. Acland, Vicar of Broad Clyſt, Devon. 2 L. P.
Rev. Dr. Adams, Maſter of Pemb. Coll. Ox. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Adams, Rector of S. Okington, Eſſex.
Rev. Mr. Alderſon, Norwich, L. P.
Rev. Mr. Allenſon, M. A. Fell. of Jeſus C. Camb.
Mr. Allington, of Peter-houſe, Camb.
Rev. Mr. Alt. L. P.
Lord Viſcount Althorp. L. P.
Mr. Anſtey, B. A. of Trinity Coll. Camb.
R. Pepper Arden, Eſq.
Rev. Mr. Atkinſon, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
Rev. Mr. Atkinſon, M. A. Fell. of Trin. H. Camb.
John Aubrey, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Mr. Auſtin, Fell. of Wadham Coll. Oxf. L. P.
Mrs. Awſe of Windſcott, Devon. 10 L. P.

B.

The Lord Bagot, 2 L. P.
Rev. Dr. Bagot, Dean of Chriſtchurch, Ox. 6 L. P.
Richard Bagot, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Sir G. Baker, Bart. M. D. Phyſician to the Q. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Bale, Stud. of Chriſtchurch, Oxf. L. P.
Sir Joſeph Banks, Bart. P. R. S. 12 L. P.
John Baring, Eſq. M. P. for the c. of Exeter, 2 L.P.
Rev. Dr. Barker, Princ. of Braſennoſe Coll. Ox. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Barnard, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
The Hon. Daines Barrington, 2 L. P.
Rev. Dr. H. Barton, Warden of Merton Coll. L.P.
A perſon unknown, by Dr. H. Barton, 40 S. P.
Rev. Philip Barton, Subdean of Exeter, 10 L. P.
Mr. Baſtard, L. P.
Rev. Mr. Bathurſt, of New Coll. Oxf.
Edw. Dav. Batſon, Eſq. L. P.
C. W. Batt, Eſq. 2 L. P.
J. T. Batt, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Mr. Thomas Bayley, of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Mr. J. Baynes, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb. L.P.
Rev. Mr. J. Baynes, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Ox. L.P.
Rev. Dr. Beadon, Maſter of Jeſus Coll. Camb. L.P.
Henry Beavis, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Becke, of Oriel Coll. Oxf. L. P.
—— Bell, Eſq. L. P.
Capt. Bellew, Exeter, L. P.
Thomas Bellew, Eſq. Exeter, L. P.
Mr. T. Belton, of Great Torrington, Devon.
Mr. Benſon, of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Rev. Scrope Berdmore, B. D. Fell. of Mert. C. L.P.
Rev. Dr. Beridge, of Jeſus Coll. Camb. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Bernard, late Provoſt of Eton, 10 L. P.
Mr. Scrope Bernard, M. A. Stud. of C.C. Ox. L.P.
Rev. Dr. Biſſet, 2 L. P.

Charles

Charles Blagden, M. D. L. P.
Alexander Blair, Eſq. L. P.
Mr. Boddam, Fell. Com. Trin. Coll. Camb. L. P.
W. M. Bogdani, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Mr. Bonney, B. A. of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Booth, Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.
Mrs. Borlaſe, of Cornwall. 4 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Borlaſe, Regiſ. of the Univ. Camb. L.P.
Rev. Mr. Bowen, Fell. of Braſennoſe Coll. Oxf.
Foſter Bower, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Thomas Boyce.
Rev. Mr. Bradley, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Dr. Brandé. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Breeks, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
Mr. Egerton Bridges, of Queen's Coll. Camb.
The Hon. Ch. Brodrick, of Clare H. Camb. L. P.
Robert Bromfield, M. D. F. R. S. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Brown, Maſter of Pembroke H. Camb.
Iſaac Hawkins Browne, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Jacob Bryant, Eſq. 2 L. P.
George Buck, Eſq. L. P.
Lewis Buck, LL. D.
Mr. Buckland, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Benj. Buckler, D. D. Fell. of All S. C. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Buller, Canon of Windſor. 4 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Bulmer, of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
John Burgeſs, M. D 2 L. P.
Mr. T. Burgeſs, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Richard Burk, jun. Eſq. L. P.
Mr. Joſeph Burrow, Exeter. L. P.

Rev. Mr. Burt, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.
Francis Burton, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Charles Butler, Eſq. 2 L. P.

C.

Library of Catharine Hall, Cambridge. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Carr. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Chancellor Carrington. L. P.
Mrs. Cartwright, of Exeter. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Caryl, late Maſter of Jeſus C. Camb. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Cauſley, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
Edward Chamberlayne, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Chamberlayne, Fell. of Eton Coll. L. P.
Mrs. Chambers. L. P.
Mr. Henry Chambers. L. P.
Anthony Champion, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Earl of Charlemont. L. P.
Mr. Nathaniel Chauncy.
The Lord Bp. of Cheſter. L. P.
Sir John Chetwood, Bart. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Chevalier, Maſter of St. John's C. Cam. L. P.
Sir John Chicheſter, Bart. L. P.
John Chicheſter, Eſq. of Youlſton, Devon. 2 L. P.
Library of Chriſt's Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr Churchill, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. Chute, jun. Fell. Comm. of Clare H. Camb.
William Clark, Eſq.
Mr. Clarke, M. A. Fell. of Caius Coll. Camb.
Lieut. Hamilton Clarke, Exeter. L. P.

Rev.

Rev. Mr. Cleaver, Fell. of Braſennoſe Coll. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Euſeby Cleaver. 2 L. P.
Mr. Coates, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. W. Cole, M. A. Fell. of King's Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Collier, Prof. Heb. Camb. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Collinſon, Fell. of Q. Coll. Ox. L. P.
George Colman, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Colombine, Norwich. L. P.
Mr. Conant, Fell. Com. of Trin. C. Camb. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Coneybeare. 2 L. P.
Hon. and Rev. E. Conway, B. A. F. of A.S.C. L.P.
—— Conway, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Cooke, Dean of Ely L.P.
Rev. Mr. Cooke.
Rev. Dr. Cooper. 2 L. P.
Mr. Coulthurſt. Fell. Com. of Peterhouſe, Camb.
Peregrine Courtnay, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Cracherode, M.A. Stud. of C.C.Ox. 10 L.P.
Rev. Mr. Cranke, M.A. F. of Trin. Coll. Cam. L.P.
Rev. Mr. Craven, B. D. Prof. of Arab. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Crowe, of New Coll. Oxf. L. P.
John Culme, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. J. Cutler, M. A. Rec. of Droxford, Ha. L.P.
Mr. Samuel Cutler. 2 L. P.

D.

Rev. Mr. D'Aeth, Rector of Eythorn, Kent.
Denis Daly, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Dampier, Preb. of Durham. 2 L. P.

Rev.

Rev. Mr. Darling.
Rev. Mr. Davidſon, F. of Peter-houſe, Camb. L.P.
Rev. Dr. Davies, Maſter of Eton-School. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Davies, M. A. F. of Trin. C. Camb. L. P.
—— Dawkins, Eſq. Gent. Com. of C.C. Ox. L.P.
The Duke of Devonſhire. L. P.
The Dutcheſs of Devonſhire. L. P.
Mr. Dickenſon, of Peter-houſe, Camb. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Diſney. L. P.
Rev. Fletcher Dixon. L. P.
Rev. John Dixon.
Lieutenant Henry Dodd, Exeter. L. P.
Richard Doidge, Eſq. 4 L. P.
John Engliſh Dolben, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Donald, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
Rev. Mr. Done, Fell. of C. C. C. Oxf. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Dowſon, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
Edward Drummond, Eſq. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L.P.
Robert Hay Drummond, Eſq. of C. C. Ox. 2 L.P.
Richard Roſe Drew, Eſq. Exeter, 2 L. P.
Dr. Duck, Norwich. L. P.
The Lord Viſcount Duncannon. L. P.
Mr. Dunſterville, Surgeon at Plymouth. L. P.

E.

Mr. C. Edmonſtone, of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Edwards, Fell. of Jeſus Coll. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Edwards.

Turner

Turner Edwards, Eſq. of Jeſus Coll. Oxf. L. P.
William Elford, Eſq. Plympton. L. P.
Mr. Eliot, jun. Fell. Com. of Pemb. Hall, Camb.
Earl of Egmont. L. P.
Counteſs of Egmont. L. P.
Right Hon. Welbore Ellis. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Elſton.
Rev. F. H. Egerton, M. A. Fell. of All Souls Coll.
Rev. Mr. Empſon, M. A. of Cath. Hall, Camb.
Library of Eton College. 2 L. P.
Sidney Evelyn, Eſq. L. P.
Mr. Everitt, of Trinity Hall, Camb.
Literary Society at Exeter.
Mr. Eyton, of Jeſus Coll. Oxf. L. P.

F.

Thomas Falconer, Eſq. of Cheſter. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Farmer, Maſter of Emanuel C. Cam. L.P.
Mr. Farquharſon, of Peter-houſe, Camb.
Mr. Filmer, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Hon. and Rev. D. Finch, B. A. Fell. of A. S. C.
Rev. Mr. Foley, Fell. of Braſennoſe Coll. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Foot, Rector of Drew, L. P.
Rev. Mr. J. Foot. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Foſſe.
Rev. Dr. Fothergill, Prov. of Q. Coll. Oxf. 3 L.P.
Rev. W. Fothergill, M. A. Fell. of Q. Coll. Oxf.
Mr. T. Fothergill, M. A. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
Mr. James Fothergill, B. A. of Queen's Coll. Ox.

John

John Fraine, Eſq. Chelſea. L. P.
Capt. Fraine, Bath. L. P.
R. Frankland, Eſq. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Fulham. L. P.

G.

Rev. Mr. Gandy. L. P.
John Whalley Gardiner, Eſq.
Rev. Mr. Gardiner, Fell. of Catharine H. Camb.
Dr. Garthſhore.
Edward Gibbon, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Geo. Abr. Gibbs, Eſq. of Exeter. L. P.
Rev. Francis Giſborne. L. P.
Thomas Giſborne, Eſq. 12 L. P.
Thomas Giſborne, M. D. 7 L. P.
The Lord Biſhop of Glouceſter. L. P.
Dr. Glynn, Fell. of King's Coll. Camb. 2 L. P.
Mr. Ambroſe Godfrey.
Rev. John Gooch, M. A. of Chr. Ch. Ox. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Gould, M. A. of Cl. Hall. Camb. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Graham, of Netherby, Cumb. 2 L. P.
Mr. Edw. Granger, Exeter. L. P.
William Graves, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Green, Chaplain of St. Thomases Hoſp.
Rev. Mr. Greene, Norwich. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Greenſide, Fell. of Cath. Hall. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Gratton, M. A. of Trinity Coll. Camb.
Hon. Mr. Greville. L. P.

Mrs.

Mrs. Griffith, L. P.
Mrs. Griffith of Liſſon Green. L. P.
Richard Griffith, jun. Eſq. L. P.
Miſs Griffith. L. P.
Mr. Griffith, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. Chriſtopher Gullet, Exeter. L. P.
Mr. J. Gunning, Serj. Surg. Ext. to the King. L.P.

H.

Mr. Hailſtone, of Trinity Coll. Camb.
Rob. Haliſax, Apoth. to the King's Houſehold. L.P.
T. Hall, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Mr. Hallifax, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. L. P.
William Hamilton, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. Dr. Hey, of Sidney Coll. Camb.
Mr. Hamley, Surgeon, at Milbrook. L. P.
Joſ. Chaplin Hankey, Eſq.
Rev. Mr. Hardcaſtle, Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.
Chriſtopher Harris, Eſq. Plymouth. L. P.
David Hartley, Eſq. L. P.
Mr. Harwood, M. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L.P.
John Hatſell, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Mr. Hawkins, F. C. of Trin. Coll. Camb. L. P.
Mr. G. Hawkins, Surg. to the K's Houſhold. L.P.
Iſaac Hawkins, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. E. Hawtrey, M. A. Rect. of Monxton, Ha. L.P.
Mr. Haydon, Bookſeller at Plymouth. 2 S. P.
Mr. Haye, B. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.

Mr. T. Haye, B. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
The Hon. Mr. Juſtice Heath. 10 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Heath, Maſter of Harrow School. 2 L.P.
Rev. Mr. Heath, of Eton. L. P.
William Heberden, M. D. 10 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Heberden, Prebendary of Exeter.
Rev. Dr. Hemington, Canon of Chr. Ch. Ox. 2L.P.
Rev. Mr. Henley. L. P.
Miſs Henſhaw. L. P.
Bold Fleetwood Heſketh, Eſq. of Magd. C. Oxf.
1 L. and 1 S. P.
Rev. Mr. Hill, Taviſtock.
Mr. Hill, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. James Hine, Exeter. L. P.
Rev. Mr. William Hole.
Rev. Mr. Hole, Archdeacon of Barnſtaple. 2 S. P.
Rev. R. Hole, Rector of N. Tawton, Devon.
Rev. Dr. Hollingberry, Archd. of Chicheſter. L.P.
Rev. T. Hornſby, Sav. Prof. of Aſtron. Oxf. 4 L. P.
Mr. J. W. Hoſkins, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. How, of Peter-houſe, Camb.
Mr. Hubberſty, B. A. Fell. of Queen's C. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Hughes, Chaplain of the D. Y. Plym. L.P.
W. Hunter, M. D. Phyſician Ext. to the Q. 20L.P.
Rev. Mr. Hume, of Weſtm. School. 2 L. P.

I.

Rev. Dr. Jackſon, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 4 L.P.
Rev. Mr. W. Jackſon, Stud. of Chr.Ch. Oxf. 2L.P.
Gregory Jackſon, Eſq. Exeter. L. P.

Rev.

Rev. Mr. Jackſon, of Hertf. Coll. Oxf.
Miſs James. L. P.
Sir Richard Jebb, Bart. M. D. 2 L. P.
Benj. Incledon, Eſq. 1 L. and 4 S. P.
Joſ. Ingram, Eſq. M. A. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.
R. P. Jodrell, Eſq.
Rev. S. Johnes, M. A. Fell. of All Souls Coll.
Dr. Samuel Johnſon. L. P.
Alex. Johnſon, M. D. L. P.
Library of St. John's Coll. Camb. L. P.
William Jones, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Jubb, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.

K.

Mr. Keeble, of C. C. C. Oxf.
Dr. William Keir, Hatton Street.
Rev. Dr. Kennicott, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.
Mr. Lewis Ker, M. B.
Mr. S. Kilner, M. A. Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.
Library of King's Coll. Camb. L. P.
Henry Kitſon, Eſq. Exeter. 2 L. P.
Mr. Knipe.
Francis Knox, Eſq. L. P.

L.

Mr. Lambard, M. A. Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. T. Lambard, B. A. Stud. of C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Lambert, Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
The Lord Biſhop of Landaff. 10 L. P.

Rev. W. Langford, D.D. UnderMaſ. of EtonSc. L.P.
Sir James Langham, Bart. 10 L. P.
Chriſtopher Langlois, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Bennet Langton, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Mr. Laurence, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Law, Archdeacon of Carliſle. L. P.
Edward Law, Eſq. M. A. Fell. of St. Peter's C. Ca.
Ewin Law, Eſq.
Rev. Dr. Lee, Warden of Wincheſter Coll. L. P.
Hon. W. Legge, M. A. Fell. of A. S. C. Ox. L.P.
The Lord Viſcount Lewiſham. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Leigh, Norwich. L. P.
Literary Society at Lincoln. L. P.
The Lord Biſhop of Litchfield. 2 L. P.
Rev. Dr. Lloyd, Dean of Norwich. L P.
Rev. Dr. Lort, F. R. S. and A. S. L. P.
Mr. Lovering, of St. John's Coll. Camb.
James Luke, Eſq. Exeter. L. P.

M.

Edmund Malone, Eſq. L. P.
Mr. Manley, Plymouth. L. P.
Dr. Manning, Norwich. L. P.
Mr. Manſell, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Mantell, M. A. Fell. of Benet Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Marſhall, Maſ. of the Free Sch. Ex. L. P.
Samuel Martin, Eſq. 2 L. P.

Rev.

Rev. Mr. Maſſingberd, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. 1 L. and 1 S. P.
Rev. Mr. W. Maſſingberd, of Magd. C. Oxf. L.P.
Mr. F. Maſſingberd, of Hertford Coll. Oxf.
Mr. Mathew, LL. B. Fell. of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Mr. Mathias, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Emanuel May.
Lieut. General Melvill. L. P.
John Merivale, Eſq. of Exeter. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Metcalfe, M. A. Fell. of Chriſt's C. Cam.
Rev. Dr. Milles, Dean of Exeter. 2 L. P.
Thomas Milles, Eſq. LL. B. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.
Francis Milman, M. D. L. P.
Mr. Moneypenny, of Peter-houſe, Camb. L. P.
Mr. Moneypenny, jun. of Peter-houſe, Cam. L.P.
Rev. Dr. Monkhouſe, Fell. of Queen's C. Ox. L.P.
Donald Monro, M. D. L. P.
Fred. Montagu, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. J. Montagu, M. A. Fell. of All Soul's Coll.
Rev. G. Moore, Canon Reſidentiary of Ex. 10 L.P.
Rev. T. Moore, Vicar of St. Veryan, Corn. L. P.
Earl of Mornington, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Morrice, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Hooper Morriſon, Rec. of Atherington. L. P.
Cha. Morton, M. D. Princ. Librar. Muſeum. 4 L.P.
Mr. C. Moſs, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Mounſey, M. A. Fell. of Jeſ. Coll. Camb.
Mr. Tho. Mudge, Plymouth. L. P.
Mr. J. Mudge, Surgeon at Plymouth. L. P.
W. H. Muggleſtone, M. B. L. P.

William

William Muggleſtone, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Murthwaite, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
Joſeph Muſgrave, Eſq. L. P.
George Muſgrave, Eſq. L. P.
R. Myddelton, Eſq. Gent. Com. of C. C. Ox. L.P.
W. Myddelton, Eſq.

N.

Mr. Nation, Exeter. L. P.
Chriſtopher Nevile, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Mr. Nevile, M. A. late Fell. of Jeſ. Coll. Ca. L.P.
Sir Roger Newdigate, Bart. L. P.
Mr. Newnham, M. A. of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. J. Newte, Fell. of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
John Nicolſon, Eſq. of Carliſle.
Rev. Dr. Nicolſon, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Ox. L.P.
Anth. Norris, Eſq. of Barton, Norfolk. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Norris. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Nowell, Principal of St. M. Hall. Ox. L.P.
Rev. Cradock Nowell, St. Mary-hall, Oxf. L. P.
Nicholas Nugent, Eſq. L. P.

O.

Thomas Okes, M. D. of Exeter. L. P.
Mr. Oliver, Fell. Com. of Clare H. Camb. L. P.
Paul Orchard, Eſq. Col. of N. Dev. Militia. L. P.
Dr. Oſborn. L. P.
Mrs. Oſborn. L. P.

Rev.

Rev. Dr. Owen, Rector of St. Olaves, Hart-Str.
Mr. Owen, of St. John's Coll. Oxf.

P.

Rev. Mr. Paley, Prebendary of Carliſle.
John Palmer, Eſq.
John Paradiſe, Eſq.
Rev. Mr. Parkinſon, M. A. Fell. of Chriſt's C. Ca.
Rev. Mr. Parminter.
Rev. Dr. Parr, Maſter of Norwich-School. L. P.
Mr. Parr, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
John Parry, Eſq. M. P. L. P.
John Parſons, M. D. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L. P.
Mr. Parſons, of Wadham Coll. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. Partington, of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
John Peachey, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. W. Pearce, B. D. Publ. Orat. of the Univ. C.
Rev. Mr. Peele, Norwich. L. P.
Granville Penn, Eſq. of Wadham Coll. Ox. L. P.
Dr. Pennington, of St. John's Coll. Camb. L. P.
Lucas Pepys, M. D. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Percy, Dean of Carliſle. L. P.
Mr. T. Percy, of Emanuel Coll. Camb. L. P.
Edward Peter, Eſq. of Trinity Coll. Oxf.
The Lord Biſhop of Peterborough. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Pett, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
William Pitcairn, M. D. Pref. R. Coll. Phyſ. 4 L. P.
Mr. Pitfield, of Exeter. 2 L. P.

Rev.

Rev. J. Plumptre, M. A. Vicar of Stone.
Edward Poore, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Popple, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Porter, M. A. Fell. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
The Dutcheſs Dowager of Portland. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Poſtlethwaite, M. A. Fell. of Tr. C. L.P.
W. M. Praed, jun. Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Preſton, M. A. of Trin. Coll. Camb.
Major Price, of the King's own Dragoons.
Rev. R. Price, LL. B. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Pritchett, Fell. of St. John's Coll. Camb.
Robert Prudom, Eſq. of Exeter.
Mr. Putt, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.

Q.

Rev. Nut. Quicke, Chan. of the Ch. of Ex. 2 L.P.
Andrew Quicke, Eſq. of Ethy, Cornwall. L. P.

R.

Mr. Radcliffe, of Trinity Coll. Camb.
Rev. Dr. Randolph, Preſident of C.C.C. Ox. L.P.
Francis Randolph, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Randolph, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Ox. 2 L.P.
Rev. Mr. Randolph, of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Randolph, of Magd. Coll. Oxf.
Mr. Raſtall, M. A. Fell. of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Ratcliffe, Fell. of Braſennoſe, Coll. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Rawes, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.

Mrs,

Rev. Mr. Raynes, M. A. Fell. of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Dr. Remmett, Phyſician at Plymouth. L. P.
The Rev. Mr. Rennell. 2 L. P.
Mrs. Reynolds. L. P.
Sir Joſhua Reynolds. L. P.
H. R. Reynolds, M. D. L. P.
Ambroſe Rhodes, Eſq. of Bellair, Devon. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Rhudde, Vicar of Shepherd's well, 2 L.P.
Rev. C. Richards, B. A. of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Robert Richardſon. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Richardſon, Miniſ. of St. Cuthbert's, Carl.
Rev. H. J. Rickman, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Right Hon. Lord Rivers. 2 L. P.
Mr. Roch, of Barnſtaple.
Rev. Mr. Rogers, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Giles Rooke, Eſq. Serjeant at Law. L. P.
Mr. Rookes, Fell. Comm. of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Walter Ruding, M. D. Fell. of Merton Coll. L. P.

S.

Theoph. R. Salway, Eſq. B.A. Fell. of A. S. C. L.P.
Rev. Dr. Sandby, Chanc. of Norwich. L. P.
The Lord Sandys. 2 L. P.
Mr. William Sanford, Exeter. L. P.
Mr. George Savage, M.A. Fell. of King's C. Camb.
Sir George Savile, Bart. 6 L. P.
Mr. Saunders, B. A. Fell. of Queen's Coll. Camb.
Dr. Saunders. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Schomberg, of Magd. Coll. Oxf. L. P.

Alexander Scot, Esq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Seger, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. W. Segrave, B. D. of Trinity Coll. Oxf.
—— Seward, Esq. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Shepherd. 2 L. P.
R. B. Sheridan, Esq. L. P.
Mr. William Sharp. 20 L. P.
Humphrey Sibthorpe, Esq. L. P.
J. Sibthorpe, Esq. M. A. Ratcl. Fell. U. C. Ox. L.P.
Rev. Ja. Simons, Rect. of St. Stephens, Exeter.
Rev. Jo. Simons, of Heavitree, Devon. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Siffon, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L.
Rev. Mr. Skinner, of Baffingham. L. P.
The Lord Chief Baron Skynner. 2 L. P.
Rev. Dr. Skynner, Præcentor of Exeter. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Sleech, Archdeacon of Cornwall. L. P.
Mr. Sloley, Caius Coll. Camb.
Rev. Dr. Smallwell, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2L.P.
John Smith, M. D. Sav. Prof. Geom. Oxf. L. P.
Dr. Hugh Smith, Hatton-ſtreet.
Rev. Mr. Snell.
John Speare, Esq. of Exeter. L. P.
Earl Spencer. L. P.
Counteſs Spencer. L. P.
Rev. Leigh Spencer, M. A. Fell. of A. S. Coll.
Rev. Mr. John Spurway. 4 L. P.
Rev. Mr. William Spurway.
Rev. Mr. Squire.
George Steevens, Esq. 10 L. P.

John

John Stephens, Eſq. of Coaver, Devon. L. P.
Mr. Stephens.
Rev. Mr. Stephenſon, M. A. Fell. of C. H. Ca. L.P.
Rev. Mr. Stevens.
Rev. Dr. Stinton, Chanc. of Lincoln. 20 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Stinton, Fell. of Exeter C. Oxf. 10 L. P.
Richard Stonehewer, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Storer, Norwich. L. P.
The Lord Viſcount Stormont. L. P.
Rev. Humphrey Sumner, M. A. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Sweet.
Dr. Symonds, Prof. Mod. Hiſt. Camb. L. P.

T.

Rev. Mr. Tapps, Norwich. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Tarrant, Dean of Peterborough. 2 L. P.
Edward Taylor, Eſq. L. P.
John Taylor, M. D.
Rev. Mr. Templeman, Rect. of Shaſton St. Ja. Dor.
Sir Noah Thomas, M. D. Phyſician to the K. 2 L P.
Rev. Mr. Thomas, Lect. of St. Olaves, Hart-ſtreet.
Sir John Thorold, Bart. L. P.
Mr. Todd, Bookſeller, at York.
Colonel Townſend.
Hon. and Rev. J. Tracy, D.D. Ward. of A.S.C. L.P.
Rev. Mr. Trimenhere, of Trin. Coll. Camb.
Fiennes Trotman, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Tutté, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Turner, M.A. Fell. of P. H. Camb. L. P.

Richard Turton, M. D. Phyſ. Ext. to the K. L. P.
Mr. R. Cooke Tylden, of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Mr. Tyrwhitt.
Rev. Mr. Tyrwhitt, of Wickham, Eſſex. L. P.
Rev. Mr. R. Tyrwhitt, M. A. Jeſus C. Cam. L.P.
Mr. T. Tyrwhitt, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Richard Tyſon, M. D. L. P.

V.

Rob. Vanſittart, Eſq. LL. D. Fell. of A.S.C. 2 S.P.
William Vivian, M. D. Reg. Prof. Med. Oxf. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Vyſe, F. R. S. and A. S. L. P.

W.

Rev. Mr. Wall, M. A. Fell. of Chriſt's Coll. Camb.
Rev. Mr. Wall. L. P.
Mr. Warburton of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Dr. Waring, Lucas. Prof. of Math. Camb.
Mr. Warre, of Jeſus Coll. Camb.
Richard Warren, M. D. Med. Reg. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Warton, Maſter of Wincheſter-ſchool.
Rev. Dr. Watſon, Reg. Prof. of Divinity, Cam. L.P.
Sir Charles Watſon, Bart. M. A. F. of A. S. C. L.P.
Rev. Benjamin Webb. L. P.
William Webber, Eſq. 2 L. P.
Hon. Tho. Wenman, LL. D. Fell. of A. S. C. L.P.
Earl of Weſtmoreland. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Weſton, Prebendary of Durham. L. P.
Rev. Stephen Weſton, Rector of Mamhead, Devon.

Rev.

Rev. Mr. Weſton. L. P.
Rev. Dr. Wheeler, Canon of Chr. Ch. Oxf. 2 L.P.
Mr. Whicher, C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Samuel Whitbread, Eſq. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
James White, Eſq. of Exeter. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Whitehurſt, of Ickleford, Hertfordſhire.
Mr. Whitehurſt, of Catharine H. Camb. L. P.
Mr. Whitehurſt, of Peterhouſe, Camb. L. P.
Rev. Jo. Whitfeld, Rect. of Bideford, Devon.
Mr. W. Wickham, Stud. of Chr. Ch. Oxf. L. P.
Ralph Willet, Eſq. L. P.
Mr. Williams, of C. C. C. Oxf. L. P.
Mr. W. Wilſhire, jun. of Hitchin, Hertfordſhire.
Rev. Dr. Wilſon, Canon Reſidentiary of St. Pauls. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Wilſon, M. A. Fell. of Chriſt's C. Camb.
Mr. Benjamin Wilſon. 2 L P.
Rev. Mr. Wilſon, Fell. of Queen's Coll. Oxf.
The (late) Lord Biſhop of Wincheſter. 2 L. P.
John Withers, Eſq.
Rev. Mr. Wodehouſe, Prebend. of Norwich. 2L.P.
Michael Wodhull, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Wood, Fell. of Cath. Hall, Camb.
William Woodeſon, Eſq. Viner. Prof. Oxf.
Mrs. Woodifield. 2 L. P.
Rev. Mr. Worth. L. P.
Daniel Wray, Eſq.
Sir Cecil Wray, Bart. 2 L. P.
William Wright, Eſq. L. P.
J. E. F. Wright, Eſq. L. P.

Richard Wright, M. D. · L. P.
Mr. Wyatt, M. A. Fell. of Pemb. H. Camb. L. P.
Joſeph Wyndham, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Luttrell Wynne, LL. D. Fell. of A. S. C. L. P.

Y.

Rev. Dr. Yates, Maſt. of Cath. Hall. Camb. L. P.
Edward Roe Yeo, Eſq. L. P.
Rev. Mr. Duke Yonge. L. P.
The Lord Archbiſhop of York. 2 L. P.
Mr. C. Young, Surgeon at Plymouth. L. P.

Right Hon. Lord John Cavendiſh. L. P.
Sir John Duntze, Bart. of Rockbere, Dev. 2 L. P.
Michael Morris, M. D. 2 L. P.

DISSERTATION I.

ON THE

GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY.

DISSERTATION I.

ON THE GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY.

THE aſſertion of HERODOTUS *, "that the Theo-
"logy of the Greeks was no older
"than the times of HOMER and
"HESIOD," is, I think, fully overthrown by PAUSANIAS, whoſe reſearches into the antiquities of his country were much more profound and exact, than thoſe of any other writer that is come down to us. HERODOTUS in particular, who had travelled into

* L. II. c. 53.

ſeveral neighbouring countries, to collect materials for thoſe parts of his hiſtory, appears not to have been equally attentive to the ancient traditions of Greece. Of the kings of Lacedæmon he has given a very erroneous liſt *; and in reſpect to the age and family of LYCURGUS † is contradicted by every other writer. Nor are there any traces of his having peruſed ſeveral ancient Poets and Genealogies, which appear to have been extant even in the time of PAUSANIAS. This latter quotes a verſe from PAMPHOS ‡, a writer of Hymns, which mentions the two different attri-

* Herod. VIII. 131.
† Herod. I. 65.
‡ Pauſan. p. 577. Ed. Kuhn.

butes

butes of NEPTUNE, his being the author of Chariots and of Ships. And PAMPHOS he affirms to have lived not only before HOMER, but before the Trojan war, and even before NARCISSUS *, whom OVID makes contemporary with TIRESIAS †.

Beſides, the very peruſal of Homer ſhews, in my opinion, that he was not the author of his Mythology; as he never attempts to explain it, but ſuppoſes his reader, or rather his hearer, ſufficiently acquainted with it. To which add, that ſeveral of the Græcian temples

* Pauſan. p. 773. Ed. Kuhn.
† Metam. III. 340. ſeq.

were in being long before HOMER, particularly that of DIANA at Aulis in Boeotia, which PLINY informs us * was *feculis aliquot ante Trojanum bellum exædificata.*

There ſeems to be juſt as little reaſon for the aſſertion of others, that a part of Greece, and particularly Athens, was peopled by Colonies from Ægypt. This opinion is countenanced by STRABO † and DIODORUS ‡ SICULUS; but the firſt broacher of it, I believe, was the Hiſtorian THEOPOMPUS. So ſays Proclus §; and

* L. XVI. c. 40.
† Strabo, L. VII. p. 321.
‡ Diod. Lib. I. c. xxviii. 9.
§ In Platon. Timæum, p. 30.

alſo,

alſo, that he was flatly contradicted by others, who charged him with ſpreading this ſtory out of mere prejudice. The Athenians alſo, as we learn from LUCIAN *, conſidered it as the height of paradox to talk of CECROPS as a foreigner. Let us conſider the authorities therefore as equal, and weigh the ſtory according to probability. We know a good deal of the Ægyptian cuſtoms, though not much, with certainty, of their hiſtory. The Græcian cuſtoms we know ſtill better. Now between theſe two there is a total diverſity. The Ægyptians were circumciciſed: the Greeks held that prac-

* Περὶ ἀποῤῥάδος. II

tice in contempt and deriſion. The Ægyptians indulged themſelves in a plurality of wives. The Greeks were permitted to have no more than one; and of this law CECROPS, the pretended Ægyptian, was the author. In Ægypt, according to SOPHOCLES*, weaving and other domeſtick buſineſs was carried on by the men; and the care of providing food was left to the Female. In Greece the contrary and more rational cuſtom prevailed. In Ægypt it is ſaid to have been a rule, that the Son ſhould follow his father's profeſſion: In Greece no traces of ſuch a rule are to

* Oed. Colon. 330. Philochorus, ap. Scholiaſt. ibid.

be found. The Ægyptians worſhiped Animals and Plants; the Greeks deſpiſed and ridiculed this ſuperſtition. The Ægyptians paid a ſcrupulous attention to nativities and the aſpects of the Planets: In the Græcian Hiſtory, among the various ways of enquiring into futurity by oracles, the flight of birds, inſpection of entrails, and the like, there is not a ſingle inſtance of any attempt to calculate nativities. Laſtly, the Ægyptians were particularly ſtudious to preſerve the dead body from diſſolution by their careful and coſtly method of embalming; whereas the Greeks, by committing it immediately to the Fire, ſeem to have

been deſirous of promoting its diſſolution.

Now, if Greece was not peopled by colonies from Ægypt, according to the aſſertion of THEOPOMPUS, we have no authority for rejecting on that pretence the traditions of the Greeks with reſpect to their own origin. And theſe inform us, that the bulk of the nation were indigenous; the offspring, if I may ſo ſpeak, of the ſoil; and that the firſt foreign ſettlers among them were DANAUS, PELOPS, and CADMUS.

After this it is perhaps needleſs to refute another aſſertion of

HE-

HERODOTUS * " that the Greeks " received the names of their " Gods from the Ægyptians." For if he meant to ſay, that HOMER borrowed from the Ægyptians that Theology, or liſt of Gods, which he publiſhed in Greece, this has already been refuted upon the beſt authority. And if he meant that the Greeks received that liſt from the Ægyptians at ſome earlier period, then he contradicts himſelf, and deſerves no credit either for the one or the other.

But, to put HERODOTUS for the preſent out of the queſtion, what foundation is there for ſaying

* Herod. II. 4.

ing

ing that the Greeks received the names of their Gods from the Ægyptians? Is THOTH the ſame name as HERMES *, or ARSAPHES as DIONYSUS †, or ARUERIN as APOLLON ‡, or NEPHTHEN as APHRODITE §, or NEITH as ATHENE ‖? There were indeed ſuch cities in Ægypt as DIOSPOLIS, HELIOPOLIS, and PANOPOLIS; but were theſe names uſed by the Ægyptians, or *only* by the Greeks? Moſt certainly the latter; becauſe I find, in THEOPHILUS of Antioch, that the Ægyptian word

* Clem. Alex. Strom. I. p. 303. Ed. Par.
† Plut. de. Iſid. & Oſir. p. 365. Ed. Frankf.
‡ Plut. ibid. p. 355, 6.
§ Plut. ibid.
‖ Plato in Timæo, p. 21. 1043. Ed. Ficin.

for

for HELIOPOLIS was ON *; and in DIODORUS SICULUS, that PANOPOLIS was called by the Natives CHEMMO †.

But if not the names, perhaps they derived the diviſion and attributes of their Gods from Ægypt. This is a thing much more difficult of proof. It ſeems not impoſſible, that ſeveral nations, not communicating with one another, might have each of them a ſupreme preſiding God; a God of War; a God of Love; a God of Love; a God of Eloquence, and ſo forth. Afterwards, when an intercourſe is

* Theophil. ad Autol. III.
† Diod. Sic. Lib. I.

begun,

begun, they each expect to find their own Gods worſhiped under ſome denomination, or other, by the ſtranger nation, and therefore readily find out the points of reſemblance. Thus, when the Latins and Greeks began to converſe familiarly together, they ſoon diſcovered a general reſemblance between ATHENE and MINERVA; between APHRODITE and VENUS; between ARTEMIS and DIANA; although the attributes of the Latin Deities (ſuch attributes, I mean, as were aſſigned them by popular ſuperſtition) are far from correſponding exactly to thoſe of the Græcian. However, there was ſimilitude enough to encourage the Latin Poets

Poets to apply to their own Deities every thing, without reſerve, that had been ſaid of the Græcian. And hence in proceſs of time they came to be conſidered as identically the ſame. But that the Romans did not borrow their Gods from the Greeks appears from this circumſtance, that many of the Græcian Deities * have no correſpondent Latin Deities; and many of theſe latter † have no archetype among the Gods of Greece.

In confirmation of this we may obſerve, that the Greeks were ſagacious enough to find

* Latona, Priapus, Hecate.
† Janus, Vertumnus, Flora, Pomona.

out

out their own Gods in Perſia, notwithſtanding the known contrariety of the two religions. The Perſians, we are told *, worſhiped JUPITER under the name of OROMASDES; HADES, under the name of ARIMANIUS †; VENUS, under the name of MITRA; and DIANA, under the name of ANITIN ‡. It was the ſame thing with reſpect to the Romans and the Gauls. The hierarchy, and the many peculiar ſuperſtitions of the Druids, are ſo totally foreign to every thing we know of the Romans, as to pre-

* Ariſtot. apud Diog. Laert. in Proœmio.

† Herodot. I. 131.

‡ Plut. in Artaxerxe, p. 306. Agathias, II. p. 45. Ed. Venet.

clude

clude every idea of one nation having borrowed from the other. Yet CÆSAR does not hesitate to say *, that the Gauls worshiped APOLLO, MARS, JUPITER, and MINERVA; meaning, I suppose, certain Gods corresponding in their attributes to those so denominated by his countrymen. The Gods of Scandinavia in later times were consubstantiated in like manner with the Gods of Latium. No one, I imagine, will pretend that their THOR, and WODEN, and FRIGA, were the copies of JUPITER, MERCURY, and VENUS. And yet when the Goths came to intermix with the Romans, they found resem-

* De Bell. Gall. VI. 15.

blance

blance enough between their Gods to tranſlate one of thoſe words by the other: which cuſtom appears to have been ſo univerſal, that we have no other way of rendering WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, and FRIDAY into Latin, but by calling them DIES MERCURII, JOVIS, and VENERIS.

Such an imperfect reſemblance as this might poſſibly obtain between ſome of the Ægyptian Gods and ſome of the Græcian. But that this reſemblance was general, or in any caſe ſo exact as to indicate imitation, I ſee no reaſon to believe. What traces have we among the Greeks of the worſhip of CROCODILES, and

and SERPENTS? of the Bull APIS, or the Dog ANUBIS? Has not VIRGIL * expreſsly ſet the Ægyptian Gods in oppoſition to the Græcian? and would he have done this, if the former had been archetypes of the latter, or even if the oppoſition between them had not been ſtriking?

Upon the whole, therefore, we have the beſt reaſon to conclude, firſt, that the Greeks in general were an indigenous people, αὐτόχθονες: and, ſecondly, that their RELIGION and MYTHOLOGY was radically, if not entirely, their own. And now having cleared the ground, I

* Æneid. VIII. 698.

ſhall endeavour to place that MYTHOLOGY upon its proper foundation.

This intricate ſubject will, I think, be better underſtood, if we divide the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY into two claſſes; that which is eſſential, and that which is acceſſory. The eſſential I would call the worſhip of the SUPERIOR GODS, ſuch as SATURN, JUPITER, NEPTUNE, PLUTO, APOLLO, MARS, MERCURY, VULCAN, BACCHUS, JUNO, PALLAS, CERES, DIANA, VENUS, CYBELE. Theſe may be conſidered as ſo many allegorical perſonages, repreſenting either the great diviſions of Nature, as the Heaven or up-

per ſky, the Air, the Sea, the Earth, the ſubterraneous world; or elſe thoſe operations and qualities, which have a more particular influence upon the Animal world and upon Society. Of this latter kind are the propagation of Animals, Tillage, Handicrafts, War, the art of Muſic, Divination, Hunting, and the Palæſtra. The particular divinities preſiding over each of theſe departments need not be pointed out to the claſſical reader. The only one liable to be miſtaken is that of JUNO, who has been thought by ſome to repreſent the earth: a falſe notion, founded, I apprehend,

upon theſe verſes of VIRGIL *:

Tum Pater omnipotens fœcundis imbribus æther
Conjugis in gremium lætæ deſcendit——

Whereas VIRGIL ſeems here to have had neither JUPITER nor JUNO in his eye, but to have alluded to the more ancient fable of Ουρανος and Γη, as expreſſed in a fragment of the OEDIPUS of EURIPIDES:

Ἐρᾷ δ' ὁ σεμνὸς ἔρανὸς, πλησθέμενος
Ὄμβρου πεσεῖν εἰς γαῖαν Ἀφροδίτης ὕπο.

which LUCRETIUS † has alſo adopted:

Poſtremo pereunt imbres, ubi eos
PATER ÆTHER

* Georg. II. 325.
† Lib. I. 251.

In

In gremium MATRIS TERRAI *præcipitavit.*

According to PHILO JUDÆUS *, JUNO is not the Goddeſs of the Earth, but of the Air: Ἥραν δὲ τὸν ἀέρα, καὶ τὸ πῦρ Ἥφαιστον, καὶ ἥλιον Ἀπόλλωνα—μυθογράφοις παρέδοσαν. Even the more minute parts had their appropriated Gods, though of inferior rank and power, in proportion as the ſubſtance to which they were annexed was of a greater or leſs conſequence in the viſible world. Rivers and brooks from the perpetuity of their ſtream naturally excite wonder; and that wonder ſoon begets an idea of divinity.

* Philo Jud. p. 513. Ed. Turn. See alſo Cic. de Nat. Deor. II. c. 26.

But the River from its ſuperior magnitude being a more awful object was put under the tutelage of a more important and maſculine God; whereas the Brook, which ſuggeſted only pleaſurable ideas without any mixture of terror, was ſuppoſed to derive its origin from a tender Female. Nymphs, that is, Goddeſſes of inferior rank, were in like manner conſidered as inhabiting and protecting Trees, whoſe apparent life was naturally enough attributed to the power of an inherent Deity.

Theſe I conſider as the eſſential parts or *ſtamina* of the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY. The acceſſory

acceſſory conſiſt of either ſome wonderful *phænomena* of Nature, or of ſome extraordinary Hiſtorical Facts, told in an allegorical manner, and improved into miracles. I ſhall give ſome clear and undoubted inſtances of both ſorts, which will furniſh the reader with a clue to interpret the reſt.

Among natural *phænomena* there is hardly any more awful than that of volcanoes, or burning mountains, in their ordinary ſtate; but in a time of violent eruption they become tremendous. It may be ſuſpected that the ancient fable of the Giants attacking the Gods was only an

allegorical picture of thoſe eruptions, which by the great quantities of melted minerals and aſhes which they throw up, ſeem in effect to be making war againſt heaven. This notion is ſtrongly countenanced by Strabo *; who informs us, that the part of Cilicia, where Typhon was ſuppoſed to reſide, is called *Katakekaumene*, or the Burnt Country, from the cineritious appearance of the earth. The commotions and occaſional eruptions of Ætna are attributed, we know, to Typhon and Briareus in another way. Thoſe *phænomena* not ceaſing even in the later ages, the Poets were no longer able to impute

* L. XII. p. 579.

them

them to the war of the Giants againſt JUPITER, becauſe that would have implied that the Giants were ſtill unconquered, and in a condition to renew the attack. They therefore give the ſtory another turn; and tell us, that one or other of thoſe Giants is buried under Ætna, and produces a freſh commotion of that mountain as often as he changes his poſture of lying on his right or left ſhoulder. The *Solfatara*, or Burning Country, near Naples, is accounted for by the giants being buried there *, and the thunder yet unquenched ſending up a vapour through the crevices of the earth: though

* Strabo, l. V. p. 248.

others

others indeed go ſo far as to ſay, that this was the true ſcene of the giants' war. Now, as we find that volcanoes, and countries abounding with natural fire, were attributed one way or other to giants, it is no extravagant conjecture to ſuppoſe, that the very exiſtence of giants was originally built upon theſe *phænomena*.

This however is not the only fable, to which volcanoes have given riſe. In one or two inſtances, where the diſcharge of flame has been moderate and equable, the cavity of the mountain has been conſidered by the Poets as the workſhop of VULCAN. The iſland of Lipara is one of

of theſe ſhops; and Moſyclus, a hill in the Iſland of Lemnos, another. The latter is thus deſcribed by VALERIUS FLACCUS *:

Ventum erat ad rupem, cujus pendentia nigris
Fumant ſaxa jugis, coquiturque vaporibus aer:
Subſtitit Æſonides: atque hic Regina precari
Hortatur, cauſſaſque docens, hæc antra videtis,
Vulcanique, ait, ecce domos.—

It is well known that ſeveral ſmall Iſlands have been protruded from the bottom of the Sea by volcanoes, which protruſion has in ſome caſes been effected gra-

* Lib. II. v. 336.

dually,

dually, and in others by a ſingle eruption. If we ſuppoſe the Iſland of Delos to have continued a conſiderable time about the level of the ſea, it would of courſe be ſometimes viſible to the mariner, and ſometimes inviſible, according to the calmneſs or roughneſs of the water. It is poſſible alſo that the top of the Iſland, after being ſome time above the ſurface, might ſink down below it for want of ſupport, as the new-formed hills about Veſuvius not unfrequently do. In either way the appearance of the iſland at one time, and its diſappearance at another, ſufficiently accounts for the fable of its ſwimming from place

to

to place. That this Iſland was formerly under water, and diſcovered by the gradual waſhing of the ſea, is affirmed by PHILO *, upon the authority of ancient Hiſtories. This ſufficiently juſtifies my interpretation of the fable; though its final appearance is, I think, better accounted for from the operation of a volcano, eſpecially as it was not a flat Iſland, but had a conſiderable eminence upon it, called Cynthos.

Earthquakes were common in Greece, and were attributed in their Mythology to one general

* Περι αἰθαρ. κοσμ. p. 658. Ed. Turneb.

cauſe,

cauſe, the elevation of the earth by the trident of NEPTUNE. There is however one fable which appears to have a direct reference to them, though not explained in that manner by Mythologiſts. TANTALUS, the King of Phrygia, and father of PELOPS, reſided in a city called Sipylus, ſituated upon a mountain of the ſame name *. This City was either entirely thrown down, or greatly damaged, by an earthquake during the reign of TANTALUS; who, after that, we may ſuppoſe, lived in continual dread of the like event. The puniſhment therefore which the Poets contrived for him after

* Strabo, L. I. p. 58. L. XII. p. 579.

Death,

Death, that he was every moment in dread of being cruſhed by a ſtone that hung over him, is nothing more than the ſituation in which every man muſt live, who has experienced, like TANTALUS, the horrors of an earthquake.

The ſtory of DEUCALION's Deluge I do not conſider as a fable; and I likewiſe think it had no reference to the deluge of NOAH. It cannot be the latter, becauſe the time of it is ſpecified in the Græcian Chronology *, according to which there muſt have been an interval of at

* Clem. Alexand. Strom. I. p. 321. Ed. Per.

leaſt

leaſt a thouſand years between the two. The tract of country affected by it is particularly mentioned by ARISTOTLE *. It did not even extend to the Peloponneſus, but was in a great meaſure confined to the plains of Theſſaly. From theſe circumſtances it appears to have been a very diſtinct event from the general deluge; and the ſame circumſtances furniſh alſo a ſtrong preſumption that it was not entirely fabulous.

The burning of the world by PHAETHON muſt be in part hiſtorical, becauſe the Græcian Chronologers, according to CLE-

* Meteorolog. I. p. 32. Ed. Sylburg.

MENS

MENS * fixed the time of it to a year. The event, that gave rise to this fable, is universally allowed by Mythologists to have been a long continuance of heat and drought. And the reality of such an event, which is in itself sufficiently probable, receives some confirmation from two or three scraps of History that are come down to us. CALLIMACHUS † says that in former times there was a drought in Ægypt for nine years:

Αἴγυπτος προπάροιθεν ἐπ᾽ ἐννέα κάρφετο ποιάς.

* Strom. I. p. 332. 335. Ed Par.
† Fragm. CLXXXII. See Hyginus, Fab. LVI.

And a ſimilar tradition is ſomewhere mentioned by PAUSANIAS, as being preſerved in one of the obſcure towns of Greece. But whence aroſe the fable of PHAETHON driving the chariot of the Sun? It might be ſuggeſted by the derangement obſerved in the common courſe of nature, and by the improbability, that the Sun, whoſe ordinary influence is ſo beneficial to mankind, ſhould, under the management of the ſame beneficent Governor, become ruinous and deſtructive. From this ſeeming contradiction the Mythologiſt eaſily extricated himſelf by the fiction of a new and unexperienced Charioteer. Or if we ſuppoſe with

with PROCLUS *, that this extraordinary drought was occaſioned by a Comet, the diſappearance or extinction of which, accor- to PORPHYRY †, was commonly called κεραύνωσις, this would ſhew us, why the Poets deſcribe their PHAETHON as taking ſuch an excentrical courſe, and finally deſtroyed by lightning.

The groteſque figures of rocks furniſhed alſo ſome embelliſhment to the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY. To ſay nothing of thoſe in the *Fretum Siculum*, which ſuggeſted the fable of SCYLLA and her Dogs; there was a re-

* in Timæum, p. 33, 34.
† Ibid. p. 34.

markable one in Mount SIPYLUS, which at a diſtance preſented the lineaments of a Woman in great dejection and drowned in Tears, though upon a nearer view, according to PAUSANIAS *, the reſemblance was loſt. The Mythologiſt found no difficulty in naming the perſon by whoſe Metamorphoſis this rock was produced. NIOBE, the Daughter of TANTALUS, was a native of this very ſpot; and the ſevere affliction, which ſhe muſt have felt from the loſs of her numerous progeny, naturally pointed her out as the original cauſe of this peculiar appearance.

* Attic. p. 48.

PHILOS-

PHILOSTRATUS informs us *, that, near the town of Phæſtus in Crete, there ran out into the ſea a promontory, terminating in a rock, which had the exact form of a Lion. It was natural that ſuch a rock ſhould be ſuppoſed to have had ſome diſtinguiſhed origin: and accordingly the Inhabitants reported, that this was one of the Lions that anciently drew the car of the Goddeſs CYBELE. The Boeotians equally ingenious, having in their country two naked rocks, reſembling, I ſuppoſe, two animals, pretended that one was the Fox of Teumeſſus, whoſe deſtiny it was never to be caught; the

* Vit. Apollon. L. IV. c. 34.

other the Dog of CEPHALUS, whoſe deſtiny it was, that nothing ſhould eſcape from him: which two contrary deſtinies JUPITER, according to them, reconciled by turning them both into ſtone *.

There is in Barbary, according to Dr. SHAW, a large plain, or tract of country, ſcattered over with great numbers of naked rocks, ſtanding erect, and ſo proportioned their thickneſs to their height as to carry the appearance of Men. He conjectures, and, I think, with great probability, that this aſſemblage of natural ſtatues ſuggeſted the

* Antonin. Lib. c. 41.

idea

idea of the Inhabitants of Africa having been turned into ſtone by PERSEUS, when he invaded and plundered the maritime part of that country. Seriphus, a little Iſland near Argos, where PERSEUS is ſaid to have performed another of thoſe miracles, was equally remarkable for numbers of naked rocks.

There was in the Iſland of Crete a Plane-tree, remarkable for not ſhedding its leaves in Winter *. Such a ſtriking exception to the common rule implied of courſe the action of ſome divinity: and the reaſon aſſigned by the Vulgar was,

* Theophraſt. Hiſt. Plant. Lib. I. cap. 15.

that under this tree JUPITER firſt obtained poſſeſſion of the fair EUROPA. This Plane-tree, according to THEOPHRASTUS, grew near a fountain; with reſpect to which ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS aſſerts*, that thoſe who ſat round it in time of rain were not liable to be wet. A fact which none will believe, requires no explanation. Yet it is worth while to remark the progreſs of credulity. A natural ſingularity created firſt a religious veneration in the beholder, and that in its turn produced a fictitious miracle.

* Antigon. Caryſt. cap. 179.

The

The principles of Chemiſtry were unknown to the ancients; and therefore, when they met with any mineral ſpring, inſtead of analyſing it to find out the ingredients from which it derived its properties, they were contented to derive them from the interpoſition of ſome Deity, or from ſome remarkable event of the Mythologic Age. A ſalt ſpring in Illyria, according to the popular report preſerved by ARISTOTLE, was an act of bounty from HERCULES to the inhabitants of that country. A river in Elis, whoſe water was fœtid, was ſaid to have contracted that fœtor from the arrows of HERCULES being waſhed in it,

it, after having been ſmeared with the gall of the Hydra: though about this the orthodox of thoſe days were not agreed, as ſome imputed it to the ablutions uſed to recover the daughters of PROETUS from their inſanity *.

It is pleaſant to obſerve the different uſe made of the ſame fact in different ages. A *nondeſcript* bird or plant is in our days a treaſure to the Naturaliſt, who is happy enough to diſcover it, and it ſerves him as a ſtep to aſcend into the temple of Fame. The ancient Mythologiſt applied it to a different

* Pauſan. Eliac. I. p. 387.

purpoſe.

purpoſe. He commonly found out ſome unfortunate prince or princeſs, who ſinking under the weight of calamity had been permitted by the Gods to aſſume this new ſhape. Thus PAUSANIAS informs us * that the *Epops*, or *Upupa*, was not obſerved till after the cataſtrophe of TEREUS; nor the Hyacinth diſcovered in Salamis till the death of AJAX. Novelties of the ſame kind may poſſibly have ſuggeſted many ſimilar ſtories: the appearance of new ſpecies of birds being a thing taken notice of, after the age

* Pauſan. Attic. p. 40—86.

of

of fables was paſt, by ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS * and PLINY.

I come now to lay open the other ſource of MYTHOLOGY, which conſiſts, as I ſaid, in the perverſion of hiſtory by allegorical and miraculous accounts of common facts. Of this claſs one of the moſt common fables is the deriving the birth of every eminent perſon from one or other of the Gods. This they were tempted to do for various reaſons. In the firſt place, as our knowledge of Antiquity is limited, and every genealogy muſt begin ſomewhere or other, the Genealo-

* Antigon. Caryſt. cap. 132.

giſt,

giſt, when arrived at that point, would be obliged to confeſs his ignorance of what went before, did he not, by making a God the baſis of his liſt, put a ſtop to further enquiry. All the Greek genealogies originate in this manner, ſome from a River, ſome from NEPTUNE, but much the greater part from JUPITER: by which we are to underſtand nothing more than that the Genealogiſt was come to the end of his line, and had no real anceſtor to ſubſtitute.

A ſecond cauſe that greatly increaſed the number of theſe ſpurious Gods, was, I ſuppoſe, the convenient covering that ſuch

ſuch a pretence gave to female frailty. The wife or daughter of an ancient Chieftain, who liſtened to the dictates of love, had this advantage above the modern Beauty, that ſhe had a chance of deriving honour from her gallantries: and if her parents or husband concurred in the fraud, or even if they were unrelenting and ſceptical, might ſtill hope to be enrolled among the ſpouſes of the Gods, provided her pretenſions were not rendered abortive by an imprudent and unſeaſonable diffidence. To point out particular inſtances would be blaſting that reputation, which the Ladies of Antiquity wiſhed no doubt to pre-

ſerve

ſerve to the lateſt poſterity. But it will be no breach of decorum to obſerve, that EURIPIDES * mentions it as a common practice of indiſcreet young women to extenuate every amorous failing by making ſome God or other the partaker of it.

The Gods had indeed a ſet of retainers, who ſometimes acted as deputies for them on thoſe occaſions. The prieſts and ſubordinate officers of their temples, who are repreſented as leading a life of feaſting and drunkenneſs (ἐν ἑορταῖς ἀεὶ καὶ μέθαις ὄντες †) availed themſelves ſome-

* Ion. v. 1513.

† Schol. in Hermog. p. 226.

times of their connexion with the Deity to obtain poſſeſſion of a young and beautiful votary. JOSEPHUS * tells a remarkable ſtory of the prieſts of ISIS ſeducing a Roman Matron of great virtue, by perſuading her that the God ANUBIS was enamoured of her, and ſolicited the honour of her embraces; in whoſe ſtead they introduced to her a young Roman, called DECIUS MUNDUS. And according to PAUSANIAS † the inhabitants of Temeſa in Italy were enjoined to build a temple to the *manes* of a man who had been ſtoned to death for a rape, and to of-

* Antiquitat. Lib. XVIII. cap. 3.
† Eliac. II. p. 467.

fer

fer to him every year the moſt beautiful of their Virgins, upon whom the immortal raviſher appears to have exerciſed both his luſt and his cruelty. This practice continued for a long ſpace of time; till EUTHYMUS, an Olympian Boxer, happening to paſs that way, became enamoured of the beautiful victim; and undertook to be her champion, upon condition of becoming afterwards her husband. For a perſon trained to athletic combats, the inmate of the temple, though a divinity, was no match. He was conquered by EUTHYMUS, and in deſpair, as the ſtory informs us, threw himſelf into the ſea, and was heard

of no more. Theſe well-atteſted ſtories render it probable, that it was not APOLLO, but his prieſt, that ſollicited the embraces of CASSANDRA, and that the courtſhip of Io, ſo particularly deſcribed in ÆSCHYLUS *, was an artful contrivance, ſimilar to that of the prieſts of ISIS in JOSEPHUS, except that the lover of Io was the Prieſt himſelf. When any of theſe plots ſucceeded, the innocent lady would of courſe aſcribe her pregnancy to the God, by whoſe name ſhe had been ſeduced.

The ſuppoſed offspring of the Gods were ſtill further mul-

* Prom. v. 645. ſeq.

tiplied

tiplied by a fourth cauſe, the admiration which excellence of every kind naturally excites in the world. This was generally thought to denote, or at leaſt it was conſtrued as a mark of, divine parentage; and the particular divinity picked out as the Father, was determined by the nature of the diſtinction *. A good Archer was reputed to be the Son of APOLLO; and I remember to have ſeen a paſſage in ſome ancient author, where the tradition is accounted for in this very manner. It was probably for ſkill in divination that IAMUS, the Augur men-

* Euſtath. in Iliad. A. p. 14.

tioned by PINDAR *, was ſuppoſed to derive his birth from the ſame God. THEAGENES, an Athlete of remarkable ſtrength, was reported by his countrymen the Thaſians to be the ſon of HERCULES †. The great warrior and the crafty orator were in like manner celebrated, one as the Son of MARS, the other of MERCURY. Excellence in Horſemanſhip or in Navigation denoted the party to be the Son of NEPTUNE; and extenſive dominion, of JUPITER. DÆDALUS, the famous ſtatuary, was celebrated as the ſon of VULCAN,

* Ol. VI. v. 74.
† Pauſan. Eliac. II. p. 477.

and

and APOLLONIUS * mentions one PALÆMONIUS, who attained the ſame honour on account of his lameneſs. To call a ſkilful and fortunate husbandman the ſon of CERES would have interfered perhaps with a known fact; and therefore the mythologiſts were obliged to compliment IASION in a different way, by pretending that CERES was ſo enamoured of him as to admit him to her bed.

The meaning of theſe fables was probably as well underſtood as a modern Poet is, who calls his Patron a ſon of MARS; with this difference, that among the

* Apollon. Rhod. Lib. I. v. 202.

ancients the fact might not be entirely disbelieved. With reſpect to death, MYTHOLOGY makes no diſtinction of ranks. Yet in ſome deaths the Gods were ſuppoſed to be particularly concerned. It is obſerved by EUSTATHIUS *, that Homer attributes the ſudden deaths of Men to APOLLO, as of Women to DIANA. It ſhould ſeem however that this was not wholly confined to ſudden deaths, as their arrows are ſaid to have killed the children of AMPHION and NIOBE, who according to PAUSANIAS † died of the plague. CALLIMACHUS ‡ alſo aſcribes the

* Euſt. in Iliad. T.
† Boeot. p. 721.
‡ H. in Dian. v. 126, 7.

deaths

deaths of women in childbed to DIANA. Mr. MARKLAND on EURIPIDES * remarks, that it was cuſtomary to attribute deaths from any ſudden caſualty to the paſſionate regard of ſome God, taking the beloved object from the world to himſelf. Thus ORITHYIA, blown, I ſuppoſe, from a precipice by the wind, was reported to be carried off by BOREAS; HYLAS, drowned in a fountain, to be pulled in by the Water-nymphs; and AMPHIARAUS, who in the hurry of his flight from Thebes fell with his chariot into a deep chaſm, to have been ſnatched into the bowels of the Earth by

* Suppl. v. 929.

the Gods themſelves, as a reward of his virtue. This, as appears from ſome epigrams and inſcriptions, quoted by Mr. DORVILLE *, was the common conſolation of every parent and relation, to whom ſuch diſaſters happened. That accidents from lightning ſhould be imputed to JUPITER, is not to be wondered at, that fire appearing ſo manifeſtly to come from heaven. But it is worth remarking, that perſons killed in this manner were not always looked upon as objects of the divine wrath. That idea would have been too ſevere upon their ſurviving friends; and therefore, though the Mythologiſts admitted ſuch

* Ad Chariton. p. 258.

a ca-

a cataſtrophe to be penal, where the party was obnoxious, yet their general doctrine was, that to be ſtruck with lightning was a mark of the ſpecial favour of JUPITER *.

So far we have endeavoured to point out ſome general principles of MYTHOLOGY. In what follows there is no appearance of any ſuch principle, the tranſactions of mankind being indeed too anomalous to be arranged into diſtinct claſſes. We ſhall find however, that when any remarkable fact occurred, the invention of the Mythologiſts was always ready to give it a

* Artemidorus Lib. II. cap. 8.

new

new and a magnificent colouring.

We will begin with CECROPS, the moſt ancient of the Athenian Kings. Of him it is reported that he was half a man and half a ſerpent; which PLUTARCH *, and after him EUSTATHIUS †, ſuppoſe to mean, that in the former, or at leaſt one half of his reign, he governed with the cruelty of a barbarian; in the other with mildneſs and humanity. It was by an allegory of the ſame kind according to EUSTATHIUS ‡, and, if I miſtake

* De ſerâ Num. Vindict. p. 551. Ed. Franc.

† In Dionyſ. Perieg. v. 390.

‡ In Dionyſ. Perieg. l. c.

not,

not, PLUTARCH alſo, that CADMUS was reported, after his expulſion from Thebes, to be metamorphoſed into a ſerpent; the fact being no more, than that living among the Illyrians, he loſt the humanity of the Greeks and aſſumed the ſavageneſs of that uncivilized nation.

The metamorphoſis of the people of Ægina from ants into men is explained by the ancients themſelves in a manner equally natural. STRABO * informs us, that the Inhabitants of that Iſland, to ſave the trouble of making bricks, were uſed to dwell in hollows, which they

* L. VIII. p. 576.

dug

dug under ground; a cuſtom that ſtill prevails in Wallachia, and ſome parts of Poland, where dwellings of that ſort are called *Limſinks*. The name of ants, which ſo naturally ſuggeſts itſelf, and which we can hardly help applying to a nation living in this manner, was converted by the Poets into a ſerious fiction, that the people of Ægina originated from ants, who afterwards at the interceſſion of ÆACUS were turned into men. Many other ſtories of *Metamorphoſes* are in like manner founded upon an analogy, that either the character, or ſituation, of the perſon had with that of the bird, or beaſt, into which he was transformed. LYCAON was

ſuppoſed

ſuppoſed to become a wolf, as reſembling that Animal in his ſavage cruelty. MEROPS, king of Cos, was ſaid to be turned into an eagle *, as an emblem, according to ÆLIAN, of his having been a pirate. After TEREUS had been changed into an *Upupa* by the Mythologiſts, the animoſity of that Bird againſt the Swallow and the Nightingale might poſſibly ſuggeſt the Idea, that PROCNE and PHILOMELA had aſſumed thoſe ſhapes. The anxiety of ALCYONE, and her conſtant waiting on the ſeaſhore for the return of CEYX, bore ſo great a reſemblance to the life of a Kings-fiſher, that it

* Euſtath. in Iliad. ω.

was

was little more than a metaphor to ſay ſhe became one. The followers of DIOMEDE, who died of famine on ſome deſert part of the coaſt of Italy, were ſaid in like manner to be turned into Herons, a bird that lives in the ſalt marſhes upon fiſh. This probably was the exact ſituation of DIOMEDE and his Argives in the height of their diſtreſs; and therefore their transformation, if underſtood of this time, was hardly to be called fabulous.

The power aſcribed to the fountain SALMACIS, of turning men into women, is thus explained by VITRUVIUS*. That fountain

* Lib. II. cap. 8.

was

was ſituated at the very ſummit of the hill, which overlooked the city of Halicarnaſſus; a ſpot originally occupied by the barbarous Carians, who were diſpoſſeſſed by a colony of Greeks from Argos and Troezene. Unable to defend themſelves from this injury, the barbarians endeavoured to revenge it by continual incurſions upon their invaders. At laſt however one of the new ſettlers opening a ſhop upon the borders of this fountain, and having furniſhed it plentifully with all ſorts of wares, the barbarians were allured one after another to frequent it; and in conſequence of that, ſays this Author, *e duro feroque*

feroque more commutati in Græcorum consuetudinem et suavitatem suâ voluntate reducebantur. So that the water did not produce effeminacy, according to the common tradition, but only that softness of disposition which we call humanity.

The imprisonment of MARS by OTUS and EPHIALTES furnishes another instance of an historical fact converted into a fable. EUSTATHIUS informs us*, that OTUS and EPHIALTES were two princes, who by their power and the terror of their arms kept all their neighbours in awe, and obliged them to desist from their mutual

* In Iliad. E. v. 380.

invaſions and piracies; which in the language of the Poets was putting MARS in priſon.

It appears to have been a cuſtom among the Greeks, in building the walls of any new city, to animate the builders, and give an air of feſtivity to the undertaking, by muſic. This at leaſt I infer from the manner, in which PAUSANIAS ſpeaks of the muſic uſed at the building of the new Meſſene by EPAMINONDAS *. Hence we may account for what the Mythologiſts report of AMPHION, that the melody of his lyre was ſo attractive, that the

* Meſſen. p. 345.

very ſtones followed him, and formed themſelves ſpontaneouſly into a wall ſurrounding the city of Thebes; by which, I ſuppoſe, nothing more is meant, than that the wall was ſo expeditiouſly built under his inſpection, and to the ſound of his muſic, as if the ſtones themſelves had been animated by it, and arranged themſelves of their own accord in their proper places.

The ſtory of DÆDALUS and ICARUS is, I think, well explained by PAUSANIAS *. He tells us, that ſails were the invention of DÆDALUS, and firſt

* Bœotic. p. 732.

uſed

uſed to facilitate his eſcape from MINOS, who was only able to follow him with oars. The ſucceſs of the invention to the father and ſon was ſuitable to the care of the one, and the raſhneſs of the other. The father got ſafe to the deſired port; the ſon, by carrying too much ſail, was overſet and drowned.

It is however but a ſmall part of the Greek Fables that is founded upon domeſtic facts. The principal of them are ingrafted upon the ſtories of their four principal Heroes, PERSEUS, BACCHUS, JASON, and HERCULES; who having been engaged, ac-

cording to the Poets, in expeditions to diſtant or unknown countries, their adventures would of courſe be very confuſedly and variouſly related, and muſt naturally give great ſcope for invention and embelliſhment. Had COLUMBUS, DRAKE, and RALEIGH, lived in times, when writing was little practiſed, and every thing was preſerved in ſongs; and when moreover there were no maps to aſſiſt the memory; it is eaſy to gueſs how ſtrangely their exploits would have been related; how many miraculous embelliſhments they would have received from accident or deſign; and, laſtly, how

Geo-

Geographers, in ſubſequent times, would have been perplexed to fix the ſcene of them. If this would certainly have happened where there was a real foundation of truth, it clearly demonſtrates, that there may be ſuch a foundation, even where the additional circumſtances are impoſſible or contradictory. A rational enquirer will therefore reject only that part of the ſtory which is variouſly related; and admit that, if not manifeſtly abſurd, in which all agree. Though he doubts the miraculous adventures of thoſe heroes, he will admit their exiſtence, eſpecially as the traditions, which atteſt

this, have alſo handed down to us an account of their parentage and their deſcendents.

PERSEUS, if admitted to be a real perſon, ſhould ſeem to have been a piratical adventurer, who, having collected together a band of followers, was fortunate enough to ſucceed in plundering ſome rich city or temple on the coaſt of Barbary. His other exploit in Palæſtine might perhaps be the reſcuing of ANDROMEDA not from a ſea-monſter, but from another pirate like himſelf. After this he invaded Argos, pretending to be the Grandſon of ACRISIUS, whom he expelled, and reigned in

in his ſtead. The ſtory of his mother DANAE being thruſt out to ſea in a ſmall boat, with him an infant, and their being afterwards found by fiſhermen, and carried by them to the neighbouring iſland of Seriphos, is neither impoſſible, nor at all unſuitable to the inhumanity of thoſe ages.

BACCHUS, that is, the GRÆCIAN BACCHUS, was an adventurer contemporary with PERSEUS, but of a very different kind. He appears to have been a real perſon, from the diſhonourable circumſtance of his having been vanquiſhed in battle by

PERSEUS and the Argives. PAUSANIAS, who has recorded this fact, saw himself the sepulchres of several of the female warriors *. He appears to have been equally unsuccessful against LYCURGUS, when he fled for refuge into the bosom of the sea †; that is, to his ships. Facts, so little calculated to give lustre, were not likely to have been feigned of a Deity. Against PENTHEUS indeed he had better success, through the indiscretion of that prince in coming either disguised, or without a sufficient escort, to be a spectator of his

* Corinthiac. p. 155.
† Iliad. Z. 135.

private

private orgies. He ſeems to have been the firſt perſon who thought of attaching the populace to himſelf by falſe miracles, and of cementing his connection with them by nocturnal aſſemblies and revels. By theſe contrivances he appears to have grown in the end formidable to government in ſeveral countries, though never ſufficiently powerful to aſſume it himſelf.

The word *belief* is too ſtrong to be given to any notions that can be formed of a ſubject ſo obſcure. But the probability of what I have juſt now mentioned is rather greater than that this ad-

adventurer, who was a man of full age when he came to Thebes, ſhould be the ſon of SEMELE, though it ſerved his purpoſes no doubt to pretend ſo. Neither is it neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that he was the ſame perſon who conquered India, whoſe character and name he might aſſume. In what manner he made his way may be gueſſed in part from what is recorded in LIVY * of the young man, who firſt attempted to introduce the Bacchanalian rites into Rome. The detail of this confederacy ſeems to me to be the beſt key to the arts of the Theban BACCHUS. It is not im-

* Lib. xxxix. 8.

poſſible

poſſible indeed that he might have penetrated into India, through a country, in which there were neither fortifications, perhaps, nor great cities: But if he did, it is more likely that he ſhould have been overpowered and expelled by a freſh confederacy of the inhabitants, than that his retreat ſhould have been purely voluntary.

The ſtory of JASON and his expedition to Colchis is fuller of miracles and contradictions than almoſt any part of the GRÆCIAN MYTHOLOGY; and therefore we ought not to wonder that it ſhould be conſidered by many of the

the moderns as an abſolute fiction, deſtitute of any hiſtorical baſis. Yet the ancients all admit it as a fact; their Chronologers fix the very year in which it took place; and their Geographers, with equal gravity, ſpecify the port from which they ſet ſail, and thoſe which they touched at in their voyage out and home. And as to the perſons concerned in the expedition, nothing can be more particular than the account given by the Grammarians of their parentage and the places of their reſidence.

The object of their voyage, as the poets repreſent it, was truly

6 ridi-

Pindari. Pythia IV.

ridiculous; but, as explained by hiſtorians, was every way adequate to the difficulty of the undertaking. The fable of the golden fleece, according to STRABO *, took its riſe from the method uſed by the inhabitants of Phaſis to entangle and collect the gold duſt waſhed down from the hills; which was by placing acroſs the rivers a number of ſheepſkins with the fleeces adhering to them.† And this is confirmed by APPIAN *, who intimates that POMPEY the Great, after the defeat of MITHRIDATES, made himſelf an eye-witneſs of

* L. XI. p. 499.
† Mithridat. p. 242. Ed. H. Steph.

the fact. It was natural therefore for the Greeks to consider the country of Colchis as a sort of Peru, especially when the riches of it were magnified, as no doubt they were, by the marvellous reports of travellers. It was not therefore a *single fleece* that allured them, but the conquest or general plunder of the country. Now this, it is obvious, was not to be effected by so small a number of warriors as one and fifty, which is the highest number mentioned in any of the lists: and we are obliged therefore either to reject the story entirely, or to suppose with CHARAX, an ancient Grammarian,

marian, that, inſtead of one and fifty mariners, each of theſe ſuppoſed mariners was captain of a ſeparate ſhip, if not commander of a little fleet. It ſhould ſeem from STRABO * that they at firſt penetrated far into the country, which the ſuddenneſs of the attack will very well account for; but their precipitate retreat from Colchis, the formidable fleet ſent after them by the natives, their being compelled to take a different courſe in their return, and the little we hear of the Argonauts afterwards; all this clearly ſhews that their ſucceſs was not per-

* L. I. p. 77.

manent;

manent; but that they were diſgracefully defeated and diſappointed of their booty. Had it been otherwiſe, I think we ſhould have heard more of the *Golden Fleece* after its arrival in Theſſaly, than barely what APOLLODORUS ſays *, that it was preſented to PELIAS.

What I have already ſaid will ſufficiently obviate one of the arguments, with which Mr. BRYANT has attempted to annihilate the hiſtorical baſis of this ſtory. He is right in ſaying, that *the crew of a little Bilander* † could

* L. I. c. 27.
† Analyſis, Vol. II. p. 487.

not

not atchieve ſo many exploits; defeat armies, build cities, and leave ſeveral colonies behind them. This is a point given up by all attentive and critical enquirers, both ancient and modern. Nor is the conqueſt of Peru by PIZARRO, though effected with a mere handful of men, at all a ſimilar caſe. Yet it is far from impoſſible, that the Mythologiſts, to render the ſtory more intereſting and ſurpriſing, may have dropped all mention of the *viles animæ*, that conſtituted the bulk of the army. And this is the more probable, as we find the ſame thing practiſed in reſpect to HERCULES, who is often re-

preſented as having atchieved by perſonal ſtrength, what he only did at the head of his troops. Thus of the defeating the MINYÆ EURIPIDES ſays *:

Ὃς εἷς Μινύαισι πᾶσι διὰ μάχης μολὼν
Θήβαις ἔθηκεν ὄμμ' ἐλεύθερον βλέπειν.

Whereas DIODORUS † expreſsly tells us, that he was not the ſingle actor in this exploit; but accompanied by all the young men of Thebes.

Mr. BRYANT ‡ inſiſts ſtrongly upon the contradictory accounts

* Herc. Fur. ver. 220.
† L. iv. p. 256. Ed. Weſſeling.
‡ Analyſis, Vol. II. p. 484. ſeq.

given

given by different authors of this expedition: which in his idea entirely deſtroy the credit of the ſtory. But this ſurely is inevitable in a matter which the poets, who firſt recorded it, collected only from report, and, where that was imperfect, ſupplied the deficiency from fancy and conjecture. Before the particulars of Mr. BANKSES voyage round the world were communicated to the public, ſeveral different reports were circulated in reſpect to the countries diſcovered and viſited; which reports, if ſuffered to go down to poſterity without contradiction, would have formed the baſis of

ſo many different hiſtories. Yet I think poſterity would have reaſoned ill to have denied the exiſtence of that gentleman, becauſe ſome had inſiſted that he returned home by the North, and others by the South, Coaſt of New Holland. And why might not the Greeks in like manner have full evidence of the exiſtence of JASON, TIPHYS, ANCÆUS and others; and that they ſailed upon an expedition to Colchis, and returned; without knowing exactly the rivers which they ſailed down, or the ſeas and countries which they traverſed? The one might be a matter of public notoriety, but the

the other required accurate information from the mouth of the adventurers themſelves.

But Mr. BRYANT * contends, that the ARGO muſt be a memorial of the *Ark*, becauſe it is ſaid by ERATOSTHENES † to have been *the firſt ſhip ever built*; which he truly obſerves to be inconſiſtent with what the Greek Poets and Hiſtorians have related of the ſtill earlier voyages of CADMUS and DANAUS, to mention no more: and from this inconſiſtency he again infers, that they knew not the origin of their own traditions. But it ſhould be

* Analyſis, vol. II. p. 493. ſeq.
† Aſteriſm. p. 13. ed. Oxon.

obſerved, that the ancient writers are far from being unanimous in repreſenting the ARGO as *the firſt ſhip ever built*. DIODORUS SICULUS tells us *, that it was the firſt ſhip that had ever been built *of ſo conſiderable a ſize*; and PLINY the Naturaliſt †, that it was the firſt *long* ſhip. If we only ſuppoſe, that the ARGO was *the firſt ſhip*, of which any memory or tradition had been preſerved, *that ſailed from Greece* upon a diſtant and hazardous expedition, we need not be ſurpriſed, I think, to find, that in time it came to be conſidered, in the popular

* L. IV. p. 285. Ed. Weſſeling.
† L. VII. c. 57.

MYTHOLOGY of Greece, as *the firſt ſhip that was ever built.*

Mr. BRYANT further ſays *, that the Argonautic hiſtory muſt have had its origin in ſome country ſouth of Greece, becauſe the *conſtellation* ARGO is *not viſible in ſo northern a latitude.* But this argument I apprehend is much more forcibly applied in another place † to combate the *ſuppoſition* of Sir ISAAC NEWTON, that the ſphere, in which the *conſtellation* ARGO had a place, was conſtructed by CHIRON for the uſe of the Argonauts. To make it of any weight in the preſent queſ-

* Analyſis, vol. II. p. 497.
† Ibid. vol. II. p. 479.

tion, Mr. BRYANT ſhould have ſhewn, that the *conſtellation* ARGO was not viſible in any country inhabited by Greeks, or where the language, and hiſtory, and fables of Greece, were current. On the contrary, he allows himſelf *, that it was viſible in Rhodes, where HIPPARCHUS is known to have made ſome of his obſervations; and in Cnidus, the birth-place and reſidence of the famous aſtronomer EUDOXUS, whoſe deſcription of the cœleſtial phænomena ARATUS is ſaid to have copied. This argument therefore being put out of the way, I ſee no reaſon for attri-

* Analyſis, vol. II. p. 497.

buting

buting the groundwork of the ſtory to any nation but the Græcians, who claim it. And this is further confirmed by the word *Argo*, which is evidently of Greek origin, being formed from the adjective αργος, *ſwift*, by the ſame analogy as Γοργω, Κελαινω, Καλλισω, Αρισω, and, I believe, ſome other proper names are from their kindred adjectives.

Before I quit the ſtory of JASON, I will juſt obſerve, that there are two fables connected with it, which admit of no very difficult explanation. The HARPIES, who were uſed to come ſuddenly, and carry off the food that

that was ſet before PHINEUS, were probably pirates, who landed every now and then to plunder the coaſt; till finally driven away by the two winged ſons of BOREAS, who commanded a part of the Argonautic fleet. Perhaps the ſtory of TANTALUS, ſtarving in the ſight of his food, may denote, in like manner, the ſudden incurſions of robbers, who laid waſte his country juſt before harveſt. But to wave this. The other miracle, to which I alluded, was, *the ſpeaking keel* of the ARGO, which I take to have been ſuch another juggle as that of SERTORIUS, pretending to receive directions from heaven through the

the means of a doe: which the Spaniards readily believing, obeyed his orders with a blind ſubmiſſion *. But *the ſpeaking keel* might have impoſed upon an aſſembly of mariners in a more enlightened age; nor did it require any thing to carry on the impoſture, but the faculty of ſpeaking inwardly, without opening the lips or teeth, in the manner of the ἐγγαστριμυθοι.

The ſtory of HERCULES is more intricate and perplexed than that of any ancient hero whatever; at the ſame time that there is very ſtrong evidence of ſuch a perſon

* Plutarch. Vit. Sertorii.

having

having exiſted in Greece, and performed many not incredible exploits. The old *hiſtorical* Mythologiſts ſeem perfectly aware of this, and take care to inform us, that the actions attributed to HERCULES are not all to be underſtood of the *Theban* HERCULES, but ſome of the *Ægyptian*, and others of the *Tyrian*; and that all theſe have been blended together by the *fabulous* Mythologiſts into one ſeries of events. As Ηρακλης has ſtrongly the appearance of a Græcian name, it ſeems at firſt view difficult to conceive, how ſuch a name ſhould have been borne by any one in either of

thoſe nations, whoſe language was very different, and who were very unlikely to borrow from the Greeks in that very remote period, in which the Tyrian and the Ægyptian chieftain are placed. Nor is it all eaſy to comprehend, how the actions of one man ſhould be imputed to another, who lived in a remote country above a thouſand years later. Yet both theſe ſuppoſitions will perhaps be rendered credible by premiſing a few reflections. We may recollect then, that among the ancients it was no ſingular piece of vanity for princes to aſſume, or ſuffer their flatterers to confer upon them, the name of

ſome

ſome Hero or Demigod, whoſe character might be ſuppoſed to have ever ſo ſlight a reſemblance to their own. To ſay nothing of COMMODUS, the Roman HERCULES, whoſe caprices are no ſtandard of ancient cuſtoms: HYGINUS, if I miſtake not, ſomewhere ſays, that CARANUS, the firſt of the Argive race who ſettled in Macedonia, aſſumed the name of his anceſtor HERCULES. The title of BACCHUS was alſo much coveted. It was aſſumed by PTOLEMY AULETES, king of Ægypt*; and among the Romans by MARC ANTONY and CA-

* Diod. Sic. Lib. I.

LIGULA *. The northern traditions alſo inform us, that ODIN, from whom their preſent hiſtory begins, had originally another name, but afterwards aſſumed that of a more ancient ODIN, of whom no other circumſtance is now remembered. In like manner the Ηρακλης of the Greeks, who was originally called Αλκαιος, or Αλκειδης, we may ſuppoſe, aſſumed, or was complimented with, the name of Ηρακλης, from the reſemblance of his exploits to thoſe of a more antient HERCULES, well known in that age. Hence in proceſs of time, when the memory of the former was

* Euſtathius in Iliad. I.

grown

grown obſolete, his actions and adventures were attributed to the latter. But whence comes it then that this foreign hero had a Græcian name, as Ηρακλης undoubtedly is, and that not merely a name of Græcian termination, like Δαρειος, Φαρναβαζος, and many others, but compounded of two genuine Greek words, by the ſame analogy as DIOCLES and ATHENOCLES, two names that we meet with in POLYÆNUS? This is indeed a hard queſtion to anſwer, unleſs we ſuppoſe it to be a tranſlation of the Ægyptian word, as HELIOPOLIS is a tranſlation of ON, and PANOPOLIS of CHEMMO. PAUSANIAS * mentions

* Phocic. p. 836.

one MACERIS, who was ſurnamed HERCULES by the Ægyptians and Libyans *.

If therefore the ſon of ALCMENA aſſumed the title of a more ancient hero, it is not to be wondered that the itinerant poets and rhapſodiſts of Greece ſhould aſcribe to their own countryman all the brilliant actions of his nameſake: when even grave hiſtorians are ſometimes miſled by the ſimilitude of names, attributing to the younger AFRICANUS, for inſtance, what was atchieved by the Elder. Thus then it is poſſible that the diſtant expeditions to Africa, Spain, Italy, and India, may

* Phocic. p. 836.

belong to the older HERCULES, and that the theatre of the Græcian chieftain extended no further than from Greece to Lydia and the Euxine. The words of ARRIAN are very appoſite. "I "apprehend," ſays he *, "that "the HERCULES worſhiped by "the Iberians in Tarteſſus (near "which are the ſo-called pillars "of HERCULES) was the Tyrian "HERCULES †; becauſe Tarteſ-"ſus was built by the Phœni-"cians, and the temple of HER-"CULES there is conſtructed, and "the ſacrifices alſo performed,

* De Expedit. Alexandri. II. p. 88. Ed. Gron.

† See alſo Appian. Iber. p. 256. Ed. H. Steph.

"after

" after the Phœnician manner.
" As for GERYONES, againſt
" whom the Argive HERCULES
" was ſent by EURYSTHEUS, to
" drive away his kine, and bring
" them to Mycenæ, HECATÆUS
" the hiſtorian ſays, that he had
" no connexion with the country
" of the Iberians; and that HER-
" CULES was not ſent to any
" iſland called Erythea in the
" Atlantic ocean; but that there
" was a king, called GERYONES,
" in Epirus, near Ambracia and
" Amphilochia; and that HER-
" CULES drove away the kine from
" thence, being itſelf no mean
" labour. With reſpect to which
" I know myſelf, that Epirus is

" a good paſture country, and " breeds excellent kine; and I " think it not improbable, that " the fame of the kine of Epirus, " and the name of ſuch a king as " GERYONES, might be carried " to EURYSTHEUS, but that he " would never have known even " the name of the king of the " Iberians, ſituated as they are " at the extremity of Europe, or " the quality of their cattle." So far ARRIAN; and in ſupport of this notion we may obſerve, that though the ſon of ALCMENA is mentioned in general terms, as having cleared the ſeas of pirates, not one of the Græcian writers has ſpecified ſo much as a ſingle exploit

exploit of that kind. SALLUST alſo, in his hiſtory of the Jugurthine war, mentions an African tradition, that HERCULES died in Spain; and that, after his death, conſiderable bodies of Medes, Perſians, and Armenians, which had compoſed part of his army, came over and ſettled in Africa; whereas the army of the Argive chieftain conſiſted of Greeks, and principally, according to PINDAR *, of Tirynthians. When therefore this laſt-mentioned poet affirms, that HERCULES brought the wild olive-tree (Kotinos) to Elis from the country of the

* Ol. X. 40. Iſthm. VI. 40.

Hyperboreans*, which the learned GESNER † ſuppoſes to be Portugal, we ought, I believe, to refer the former part of the aſſertion to the Græcian HERCULES; and the latter, that is, the expedition to Portugal, to the Tyrian, who might alſo be the perſon that ſubdued CACUS the robber, and fought with ERYX.

But how then ſhall we reconcile this with what SYNESIUS tells us ‡, that in the public regiſters of the city of Cyrene was recorded, till the invaſion of the Barbarians, a liſt of deſcendents in

* Ol. III. 25.
† De Phœnic. Navig. Præl. II. § 8.
‡ Opp. p. 302. Ed. Petav.

regular

regular ſucceſſion from HERCULES to himſelf? Does not this imply, that the Græcian HERCULES viſited Africa, and founded Cyrene? Yet on the other hand PINDAR, who wrote two Odes * to ARCESILAUS, king of Cyrene, gives not the leaſt hint of HERCULES having been there, and much leſs of his having founded that city. I preſume, therefore, that SYNESIUS muſt mean only, that Cyrene, having been ſettled from the iſland of Thera, which was a Spartan colony, the firſt ſettlers brought with them, and kept memorials of their deſcent from the kings of

* Pyth. IV & V.

Sparta and their progenitors as far back as Hercules. And this I think will tally ſufficiently with what SYNESIUS ſays, at the ſame time that it accounts for the ſilence of PINDAR.

If we ſuppoſe, that the ſon of ALCMENA never ſailed to Spain or Africa, it will ſtrike off from the liſt of his labours the acquiſition of the Heſperian apples. Of the remaining ten (for the conqueſt of the triple GERYONES, that is, GERYONES and his two brothers, has been already diſcuſſed), of theſe, I ſay, the killing of the Nemeæan LION may be literally true; as it is

far

far from impoſſible, that a ſtrong active man, if lucky enough to give a lion a ſtunning blow on the head with a heavy club, might eaſily ſeize and throttle him, before he recovered from his vertigo. PAUSANIAS even mentions one POLYDAMAS *, who maſtered and killed a lion without any weapon at all. The fetching of CERBERUS from hell, PAUSANIAS † explains to mean the deſtroying of a great ſerpent, that inhabited a chaſm of the earth at Tænarus; which is ſtrongly countenanced by what EUSTATHIUS tells us from other authors (for he does not appear to have read the tra-

* Eliac. II. p. 469.
† Lacon. p. 275.

vels

vels of PAUSANIAS), that CERBERUS was repreſented by the ancients with the head of a ſerpent. Nor was this an atchievement unworthy of HERCULES. Serpents are found at this day in the Eaſt Indies of an enormous length, from fifty to one hundred and fifty feet: who, except when gorged with food, are greatly an overmatch for any animal. Such a one it probably was that the Roman army deſtroyed, though not without the help of a catapult, near the river Bagrada*. A ſerpent of this ſize, lying at the mouth of a tremendous chaſm, might naturally be

* A. Gellius, VI. 3.

called

called *the Dog of Hell*, as the hydra, a ſuppoſed ſerpent, is called by EURIPIDES *the Dog of Lerna* *.

Two or three of the labours of HERCULES appear to be hiſtorical facts, diſguiſed by allegory. The ſtory of the HYDRA related probably to ſome crew of Banditti, who ſheltered themſelves in the woods and, though defeated and driven from place to place, continually returned, till IOLAUS, ſetting fire to the woods, compleated their deſtruction. The STYMPHALIAN birds muſt alſo be allegorical, if APOLLODORUS† had

* Herc. Fur. v. 420.
† Lib. II. p. 108.

any foundation for ſaying, that they took refuge in the woods, to avoid being the prey of *wolves*. As they are reported to have deſtroyed the grain (καρπος *) it is not unlikely, that they might be diſtreſſed people driven from their own houſes by ſome powerful enemy, called *wolves* in the fable, and reduced from neceſſity to become robbers in their turn. The ſtory of their ſhooting of their wing-feathers like arrows indicates, I think, the nature of the weapons which they uſed. The ſtory concludes with their being driven from the woods by the terror of a brazen rattle, af-

* Diodorus Sic. l. IV. c. 13.

ter

ter which HERCULES deſtroyed them with his arrows. This may ſignify, that he drove them into ſome ambuſcade by a falſe alarm in the oppoſite quarter: made perhaps by the claſhing of ſhields and ſpears.

The STAG run down by HERCULES was probably a man of the name of *Elaphus*, it being common among the Greeks to give the names of animals to men. Thus we find in their writings perſons called Λεων, Κριος, Αλωπηξ, Μυς, Λυκος, and therefore why not Ελαφος? As the ſtag is ſaid to have been conſecrated to DIANA, the man I ſuppoſe was one of

of her prieſts, who had been guilty of ſome crime. HERCULES was deſirous to take him without hurting him; but not being able, after a year's purſuit, according to APOLLODORUS *, to effect this, at laſt lamed him with an arrow, and delivered him, ſtill breathing, to EURYSTHEUS.

As the ſon of ALCMENA was never unattended with ſomething like an army, his expedition againſt the AMAZONS, and that againſt DIOMEDE, king of Thrace, carry in them nothing marvellous. The ſole difficulty here

* Lib. II. p. 103.

ariſes

ariſes from the object, which hardly ſeems to deſerve a military equipment. Yet it is not difficult to conceive, that if EURYSTHEUS was ſolicitous, as we find he was, to improve the breed of his cattle by bringing Heifers from Epirus, he might think it a matter of equal importance to mend the breed of his horſes by bringing ſtallions, or mares, from Thrace. The *girdle* of ANTIOPE may ſeem to have been a very trivial conſideration; but if by *girdle* was meant a tract of coaſt, as in the following verſe of APOLLONIUS *,

Ακτῆς Θρηϊκίης ΖΩΝΗΣ ἔπι τηλεθόωσαι,

* Argonant. I. 29.

it

it will not be difficult to diſcover the end which EURYSTHEUS had in view; as the coaſt adjoining to the Amazons' country, perhaps under their goverment, was preciſely the place, if not the only place, where iron was forged and manufactured in thoſe remote times; and it was ſo much the employment and ſupport of the inhabitants, that APOLLONIUS tells us *, they entirely neglected agriculture.

Of the *twelve* labours of HERCULES the only material one unexplained is his cleanſing of the AUGEAN STABLES, that is, the

* Argonaut. II. 1004.

fences,

fences, in which AUGEAS ſecured his cattle by night, and which are repreſented as being over-filled with dung, ſo as to require immenſe labour to remove it. This however is plainly nonſenſical, as AUGEAS no doubt employed cowherds enough (and very few we know would be ſufficient) to remove the dung out of the ſtalls from day to day. DIODORUS SICULUS tells the ſtory indeed in a peculiar way. According to him *, this was a work of no great difficulty; but he ſuppoſes that HERCULES, by way of degradation and ignominy, was enjoined to cleanſe theſe ſta-

* Lib. iv. c. 3.

bles of the dung, without any aſſiſtance. But this is inconſiſtent with what all the Mythologiſts ſay, that AUGEAS ſtipulated to give HERCULES a large reward; which plainly ſhews the taſk, whatever it was, to have been of ſome importance, and too great for the number of labourers engaged in his ſervice. PAUSANIAS relates *, that the country was ſo covered with dung, as to have been rendered incapable of cultivation. And this indeed may have ſome foundation of truth in that warm climate, ſince, according to THEOPHRASTUS, dung without

* Eliac. I. p. 377.

water

water burns the ground. But a further ſolution of this difficulty is, I think, to be found in PLINY, who informs us *, that AUGEAS, king of Elis, was the firſt who practiſed the manuring of lands with dung in Greece. He probably therefore had diſcovered how much his lands ſuffered for want of water, and employed HERCULES to remedy the inconvenience: which the latter effected, not by any perſonal labour, but by ſetting his ſoldiers to turn the courſe of a river, or lay dams acroſs it, ſo as, one way or other, to overflow the country. The ſervice, it is pro-

* N. H. Lib. XVII. c. 6.

bable, was beyond expectation; as HERCULES demanded, in return for it, the half of his kingdom.

Of the explanations of ANCIENT MYTHOLOGY here given, no inconſiderable number has been handed down by the ancients themſelves, and therefore may be conſidered as ſtanding upon ſome ground of evidence furniſhed by authors and records now loſt; the remainder are merely conjectures, upon which criticiſm has its full ſcope. Conſidering the fable as an *Ænigma*, the thing required is, to find ſome probable fact, bearing ſuch a re-

a reſemblance to it, as that the fable ſhall appear to be only a natural and eaſy allegory of the truth. The compleat analogy between them is the only evidence of which the caſe will admit.

DISSERTATION II.

AN EXAMINATION OF SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S OBJECTIONS TO THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLYMPIADS.

DISSERTATION II.

AN EXAMINATION OF SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S OBJECTIONS TO THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLYMPIADS.

THE Regiſter of the Olympic Games, which is the great baſis of the Græcian Chronology, was, I believe, admitted as authentic by all the *Literati* from the revival of letters to the time of Sir ISAAC NEWTON. That moſt eminent philoſopher, after having inveſtigated with ſucceſs the laws of the material world, ſeems to have imagined, that the ſame mathematical knowledge,

ledge, which had enabled him to do this, would be equally ſerviceable to him in unravelling the difficulties of ancient hiſtory, and reconciling the diſcordant epochas of different nations. In the proſecution of this deſign he has attempted to ſhew, that almoſt all nations have been fond of carrying back their origin to too remote a period; and with that view have falſified their chronology; in particular, that the Græcians, actuated by the ſame fooliſh vanity as the reſt of mankind, have endeavoured to impoſe upon the world a fictitious ſeries of Olympic victors.

I muſt here take the liberty to obſerve, that the diſpoſition

of the Græcians to magnify their antiquity, is a thing entirely deſtitute of proof, any further than it is proved by Sir ISAAC's own book. It ought not therefore to be conſidered as a principle of argument, being indeed the concluſion to which his arguments tend: for which reaſon I ſhall take no further notice of it at preſent; but proceed to conſider the probability of his grand poſition, that the firſt part of the ſeries of Olympic victors is purely fictitious, neither the victors, nor the games themſelves, having at that time had any exiſtence.

Now in order that we may the better judge, what degree of credit

dit is due to the liſt of Olympiads, I will firſt ſtate what it was; with the external evidence in its favour. The principal witneſs is PAUSANIAS, who, in the time of the emperour MARCUS ANTONINUS, travelled over Greece in ſearch of antiquities, and was particularly attentive to thoſe at Elis. He appears to have himſelf examined the regiſter of the *Olympionicæ*; for ſpeaking of two ſtatues erected to atone for ſome unfair practices of a Rhodian wreſtler, he concludes thus*. "The Elean guides ſay further, "with reſpect to theſe Athletes, "that it happened in the 178th

* Eliac. I. p. 432.

"Olym-

" Olympiad, that EUDELUS re-
" ceived money from PHILOS-
" TRATUS, which PHILOSTRATUS
" was a Rhodian. This ſtory I
" found contradicted by the re-
" giſter of the *Olympionicæ* kept
" by the Eleans; for in that re-
" giſter it is, that in the 178th
" Olympiad STRATO of Alexan-
" dria in the ſame day carried
" away the prize of wreſtling,
" and of the Pancratium." In ano-
ther place *, he tells a remark-
able ſtory of one LICHAS, a Lace-
dæmonian, who, at a time when
the Lacedæmonians were exclud-
ed from contending in the games,
entered his chariot in the name

* Eliac. II. p. 454.

of

of the people of Thebes, and having won the race put a garland upon the driver's head with his own hands. This the Eleans reſenting ordered him to be ſcourged; which produced an invaſion of their country on the part of the Lacedæmonians. "The war being at an end," ſays PAUSANIAS, "LICHAS erected his "ſtatue here; but the records "of the Eleans ſay, that it was "not LICHAS, but the people of "Thebes, that obtained the "prize." In a third paſſage he ſays *, "the victory of the ſons "of PHIDOLAS is regiſtered in the "records of the Eleans as hav-

* Eliac. II. p. 484.

"ing

"ing happened in the 68th "Olympiad, *and not before.*" The text has it περὶ ταύτης, by miſtake for πρὸ ταύτης. From theſe three paſſages it ſeems plain, that he had inſpected the regiſter himſelf. I ſay, regiſter, in the ſingular number, though PAUSANIAS commonly ſpeaks in the plural, τὰ Ἠλείων γράμματα. For if he had meant private memorials kept by the Eleans, he would hardly have ſaid ſo confidently, as he does in the laſt quoted paſſage, that the victory of the ſons of PHIDOLAS was regiſtered as in the 68th Olympiad, *and not before.* Beſides, in ſpeaking of the 104th Olympiad, at which the Arcadians preſided, he

ſays

says *, "the Eleans do not enter it ἐν καταλόγῳ Ὀλυμπιάδων," plainly intimating, that it was one single catalogue, and the public record of the Eleans. If any doubt should remain, it seems to be removed by what he says of EUANORIDAS the Elean †, that having obtained the prize of wrestling at the Olympic Games, and afterwards becoming one of the *Hellenodicæ*, or presidents, he himself recorded the names of the victors. So that here we see it was not only a public record, but the entries in it were made by the president of the games.

* Eliac. II. p. 509.
† Ibid. p. 471.

I thought

I thought it neceſſary to explain this at large, becauſe we are told by PLUTARCH, in his life of NUMA*, that ſome objected to the liſt of the Olympiads, as being publiſhed by HIPPIAS the Elean rather late, and from no very certain materials. It appears from PAUSANIAS, an eye-witneſs, that he had the beſt materials imaginable; and being a man in high eſteem among the Greeks, and greatly entruſted by his own countrymen, though ridiculed by PLATO, it is not to be ſuppoſed, that he would publiſh a mere invention

* P. 130. Ed. Bryan.

of his own as a copy of their records. Beſides, PAUSANIAS, who was upon the ſpot, and inſpected them, gives no hint of their differing materially, or even at all, from the liſt commonly received. And we may obſerve, that XENOPHON, who lived in the country of Elis, and in the very next generation after HIPPIAS, cites one Olympiad numerically *, and probably therefore from his liſt. So that Sir ISAAC is hardly correct in ſaying †, that the reckoning by Olympiads was not in uſe among the Greeks till after EPHORUS.

* Hellen. I.
† Chronol. p. 47.

Let

Let us next enquire, whether this regiſter was kept from the very beginning of the Olympiads. And to this alſo PAUSANIAS bears teſtimony; for he ſays *, that from the time that there are uninterrupted memorials of the Olympiads, the firſt prize given was that of the foot-race, which COROEBUS the Elean won. STRABO alſo mentions COROEBUS as victor in the firſt Olympiad †; and ATHENÆUS particularly remarks ‡, that he was by profeſſion a cook. The ſame PAUSANIAS, ſpeaking of a victory gained in a war by the

* Eliac. I. p. 394.
† L. VIII. p. 544.
‡ L. IX. p. 382.

people of Megara over the Corinthians, which was prior in time to the annual Archons of Athens, ſubjoins, "but neither "were the Olympiads as yet re-"giſtered by the Eleans *;" which implies, that they began to do it ſoon after; and moſt clearly ſhews, that a public regiſter was the thing which he meant; ſince no man could ſay with confidence, that no private memorials were kept before the time when COROEBUS was victor.

That ſuch a regiſter ſhould be at all corrupted, is highly improbable. It is well known how

* Eliac. II. p. 500.

care-

careful the Greeks were of their archives. Thoſe of the Athenians were kept in the temple of CYBELE, called METROUM, from whence APELLICON the Grammarian found means to ſteal ſome of them, which would have coſt him his life, as ATHENÆUS informs us *, if he had not fled out of the country. Even the alteration of records was a capital crime among the Rhodians, as we learn from DION †; though in other places, according to Cicero ‡, it was only puniſhed by fine. That the Elean records

* L. V. p. 214.
† Orat. XXXI. p. 336.
‡ In Verrem.

had ever been altered, we have no reaſon to think, as no traces of ſuch a crime are to be found in any ancient author.

But what is the alteration which Sir ISAAC ſuſpects, or rather aſſerts, to have been made? Not merely the erazing of a name here and there, and ſubſtituting of another in its ſtead, but the entire and wilful forgery of about forty Olympiads, that had no real exiſtence *. This bold ſuppoſition far exceeds any thing that I recollect in the works of Dr. BENTLEY, whom a great poet has ſtigmatized with the epithet

* Chronol. p. 122.

of

of *ſlaſhing*. But waiving the boldneſs, let us conſider the probability of it. And here two queſtions occur; firſt, what could be the motive? and, ſecondly, how it could be accompliſhed?

The motive muſt be either private or public; private, to gratify the pride of a number of families, by attributing to them Olympic victories which they had never obtained: or public, to increaſe the reputed antiquity of the Olympic inſtitution. Both theſe motives, and the firſt in particular, ſuppoſe that the forged Olympiads were to be imme-

diately publiſhed and circulated, and not to lie dormant upon their regiſter; for in that caſe how could the pride of any family be gratified? Suppoſing therefore this ſeries of forty Olympiads, with the names of their reſpective victors, to be publiſhed, I would aſk, as the memory of real victories was always carefully preſerved in families, whether the families, to whoſe pride this ſacrifice was made, muſt not be perfectly conſcious, that no ſuch games or victories, as thoſe recorded in the forged Olympiads, had ever exiſted? And as the victors in forty Olympiads, if all the games were ſupplied with

with fictitious victors, must have been very numerous, and, upon the narrowest computation, could not be fewer than forty, the number of families entrusted with this secret must also have been proportionally numerous, much too numerous, in my judgement, to admit of the forgery passing without detection.

The public motive comes next to be considered. Now, as the Eleans, who had the custody of the Olympic Register, did not date their origin, as a nation, from the commencement of the Olympic Games, but carried it many generations further back,

I can

I cannot comprehend how their vanity could be materially gratified by proving, that this particular inſtitution was ſet on foot in the fourth century of their political exiſtence, rather than in the fifth or ſixth. Or will it be ſaid, that, by carrying back the origin of the Olympic Games, they in effect carried back the original æra of their own hiſtory? Even this could be no object to the Eleans, becauſe their hiſtory is ſo intimately connected with that of the petty nations adjoining, that whatever heightens the antiquity of any one muſt equally heighten that of the others. The whole maſs of

Græcian

Græcian hiſtory muſt move together. To increaſe the number of the Olympiads, could not therefore contribute in the leaſt to ſet them above the heads of their neighbours, which is the common, if not the only, motive, for pretending to ſuperior antiquity. Of the more diſtant and barbarous nations, they either knew too little to enter into any competition with them, or elſe they ſhewed their indifference for this fancied honour, by readily ſubſcribing, as in the caſe of the Ægyptians, to the claim of priority, which theſe laſt, with great confidence, and perhaps with juſtice, urged.

We

We are next to enquire into the poſſibility of impoſing ſuch a fiction upon the world. It is evident, that no ſuch impoſition could take place, after the time when HIPPIAS the Elean publiſhed the liſt of the *Olympionicæ*, as mentioned by PLUTARCH *. Sir ISAAC ſays, that he lived in the 105th Olympiad †; and poſſibly he might live till that time; but it appears, that in the time of SOCRATES, whoſe death happened in the beginning of the 95th, which is no leſs than forty years before, he had already attained to great fame, honours, and wealth: and therefore the pub-

* Vit. Numæ. l. c.
† Chronol. p. 47.

lication

lication of his liſt may as properly be fixed to this time, as to any other. Now, according to Sir Isaac's reckoning, the Olympiad, which we now call the 95th, was in reality the 55th, and the Olympic Games of conſequence had only been celebrated about 220 years. It is hard, it is impoſſible to conceive, that among the Greeks, who had ſo long had the uſe of letters, who had many ancient writings preſerved among them, and who were ſo remarkably fond of genealogies, that they, I ſay, ſhould have ſo entirely loſt all memory of the inſtitution of the Olympiads, as not to know whether they had

had laſted 380 years, or only 220. Set the date of the publication by HIPPIAS higher, and you ſtill increaſe the difficulty.

This however is far from being all. In the catalogue of the Olympiads, every Olympiad had its particular victors, whoſe countries, as well as their names, were ſpecified. The memory of an Olympic Victor was ſo carefully preſerved in Greece, it was ſo precious to the nation, as well as family of the Victor, that, when a new liſt came out of forty or more Victors that had never been heard of before, what muſt have been the aſtoniſhment

of

of thoſe cities and countries upon which this honour was ſo generouſly conferred by the Eleans? Muſt they not have ſeen through the impoſture at once? and, if not at once, how could it eſcape detection, perfect and complete detection, for ſo many centuries together, in a nation abounding with criticks? For that the liſt was publiſhed without any chaſms we have undoubted proof, becauſe the names of all the Victors in the *Stadium* are come down even to us, and many of them alſo are mentioned by more authors than one, who all agree as to the date of the victory.

The

The impoſture, if it took place at all, muſt relate entirely to the firſt Olympiads; becauſe the nearer it approached to the time of publication, the more certainly it would be detected. Now, the authenticity of thoſe Olympiads is ſtill further corroborated by a variety of little circumſtances preſerved in PAUSANIAS, no way neceſſary to the ſuppoſed fraud, and therefore not likely to have been invented. We are told for inſtance *, that the firſt prize was that of the *foot-race*; that in the fourteenth Olympiad that of the *Diaulos*, or *double foot-race*, was added; that in the eighteenth they re-

* Eliac. I. p. 394.

vived

vived the *Pentathlon* and the game of *Wreſtling*; that in the twenty-third the prize of *Boxing* was inſtituted, and in the twenty-eighth that for full-aged horſes. Are not all theſe marks of reality? and is there any inſtance of an impoſture being clogged with ſo many uneſſential circumſtances?

Upon the whole, it is no extravagance to ſay, that the liſt of the Olympic Victors has an authority equal, if not ſuperior, to that of any documents whatever, of the ſame kind. It conſiſted of entries made by a public officer, relative to tranſactions of

the greateſt notoriety, which the parties themſelves, their relations, and their country, were highly intereſted to keep in memory. Greater ſecurity than this for the integrity of any record it is impoſſible to have; and therefore to doubt the truth of it would be to introduce univerſal ſcepticiſm.

Having now ſhewn upon what authority the Olympic Regiſter ſtands, I come next to conſider the objections raiſed againſt it by Sir Isaac Newton; which will be found, I apprehend, to be by no means ſufficient to overturn the evidence in favour of

of its general veracity. His firſt and principal objection is taken from two liſts of Spartan kings; that kingdom by a very particular conſtitution having been governed by two contemporary kings, the lineal repreſentatives of two brothers, EURYSTHENES and PROCLES, who conquered it. The beginning of the Meſſenian war, as calculated by the Greeks, is fixed by PAUSANIAS* to the ſecond year of the ninth Olympiad, at which time ALCAMENES of the houſe of EURYSTHENES was king of Sparta, and THEOPOMPUS of the houſe of PRO-

* Meſſen. p. 292.

cles *. From this year, according to the Olympic computation, it was 263 years to the expedition of Xerxes, which happened in the firſt year of the 75th Olympiad. In this long interval of 263 years, we find only eight kings of the houſe of Eurysthenes, excluſive of Alcamenes, and only ſeven, ſtrictly ſpeaking, of the houſe of Procles, excluſive of Theopompus. The liſt of the *Eurysthenidæ* is as follows: 1. Polydorus. 2. Eurycrates. 3. Anaxander. 4. Eurycrates the Second. 5. Leon. 6. Anaxandrides. 7. Cleomenes. 8. Leonidas. This is

* Meſſen. p. 288.

the

the list of Kings as given by PAUSANIAS*. That given by HERODOTUS† leaves out CLEOMENES, because it is not a list of Kings, but only of the Progenitors of LEONIDAS, the brother of CLEOMENES. The kings of the *Proclidæ* family, according to PAUSANIAS‡, were, 1. ZEUXIDAMUS, who succeeded his grandfather THEOPOMPUS. 2. ANAXIDAMUS. 3. ARCHIDAMUS. 4. AGASICLES. 5. ARISTO. 6. DEMARATUS, who was deposed, and succeeded by, 7. LEOTYCHIDES. The list given by

* Lacon. p. 209—214.
† L. VII. c. 204.
‡ Lacon. p. 220, 1.

HERODOTUS*, differs conſiderably from this. According to him their names were, 1. ANAXANDRIDAS. 2. ARCHIDAMUS. 3. ANAXILAUS. 4. LEOTYCHIDES the Firſt. 5. HIPPOCRATIDES, whoſe ſon HEGESILAUS, and grandſon MENARES, not ſucceeding to the crown, the next king in ſucceſſion is, 6. LEOTYCHIDES, the ſon of MENARES. It is not very material to ſettle the difference between HERODOTUS, the older writer, and PAUSANIAS the more diligent antiquary, becauſe though Herodotus leſſens the number of kings, he adds one to the number of generations. Now what

* Lacon. VIII. c. 131.

is

is the obſervation of Sir ISAAC upon theſe two liſts? He tells us*, that "by the ordinary courſe "of nature kings reign one with "another about 18 or 20 years "a-piece;" and having laid down this rule, he applies it, among others, to the Spartan kings abovementioned; according to which the interval between the firſt and the laſt of thoſe kings amounts to no more than 140 years; whereas, if we reckon by the Olympiads, it makes, as I ſaid, 263.

To all ſuch reaſoning I have one general anſwer; that the

* Chronol. p. 54.

reigns of kings not depending upon the common chance of mortality, or upon any ſimple and conſtant natural cauſes, but upon a variety of natural and political cauſes, operating in conjunction; ſuch as their own folly or wiſdom, the caprice of the multitude, the treachery of their own ſubjects, and the invaſion of foreign powers: all theſe cauſes, I ſay, render the length of reigns ſo uncertain and variable, that though we may form an average of them as we may of any thing elſe, we cannot reaſon firmly and ſolidly upon that average. We cannot rationally ſay; ſo many kings of

Perſia,

Perſia, Macedonia, France, or England, reigned, one with another, about 20 years each, and therefore ſo many emperors of Japan did not reign longer. If we take the three laſt kings of France, their reigns amount in the whole to 164 years, which is at the rate of 55 years for each. But the reigns of GALBA, OTHO, and VITELLIUS, three ſucceeding emperors of Rome, did not amount in all to a year and three quarters. What dependence can there be upon a calculation of things that differ ſo enormouſly? For either we know the hiſtory of the reigns which are the ſubject of calculation, or we do not.

If

If we do not, how can we be ſure that they did not ſucceed one another as rapidly as the emperors of Rome juſt mentioned? or, on the contrary, that the crown did not devolve ſucceſſively to minors, who enjoyed it peaceably to a good old age, which was nearly the caſe of the three French kings? If we *do* know the hiſtory, then this method of calculation is ſuperſeded by poſitive and ſubſtantial evidence. So that in no caſe is it uſeful as a medium of proof; and ſhould therefore be rejected, as totally unworthy of attention.

Generations of men, though ſufficiently vague, are however a better

better ground for calculation than the reigns of kings; the one having no other limits than the period of life; whereas the generative faculty does not exiſt in full force above a third part of that period. Now, in the preſent caſe, the learned and diligent PAUSANIAS, who has probably given us the true liſt of both the races of theſe Spartan kings *, (for one of thoſe in HERODOTUS is palpably erroneous), this ſame PAUSANIAS has alſo given us a very circumſtantial account of their genealogy. Is it not therefore a little extraordinary that Sir ISAAC NEWTON,

* Lacon. p. 209 & 220.

having

having it in his option to calculate this interval of time by the more accurate method, ſhould chuſe to do it by the more vague and inaccurate? We ſhall preſently ſee, that had he calculated by generations, his objection againſt the authenticity of the Olympiads would not have been near ſo ſtrong: and one cannot therefore help ſuſpecting, that, great and candid as he unqueſtionably was, he was, in this inſtance, drawn out of the right path by a bias, imperceptible to himſelf, in favour of his own opinions.

Sir ISAAC NEWTON has ſtated very fairly his method of computation

tation by reigns, and the difference between them and generations. He ſays *, that "gene-
" rations from father to ſon may
" be reckoned, one with another,
" at about 33 or 34 years a-piece,
" or about three generations to a
" hundred years; but if the
" reckoning proceed by the eld-
" eſt ſons, they are ſhorter, ſo
" that three of them may be
" reckoned at about 75 or 80
" years. And the reigns of kings
" are ſtill ſhorter: becauſe kings
" are ſucceeded not only by their
" eldeſt ſons, but ſometimes by
" their brothers; and ſometimes
" they are ſlain or depoſed, and

* Chonol. p. 53. 54.

" ſuc-

" ſucceeded by others of an " equal or greater age, eſpecially " in elective or turbulent king- " doms." All this is undoubtedly true; and being ſo, one does not ſee with what propriety an average, drawn from this method of computation by reigns, can be applied to caſes, where we know, from good authority, that there was no revolution, or change of family, but that the crown deſcended peaceably from father to ſon. Suppoſe a calculator was to eſtabliſh this rule, that the duration of a ſhip, including accidents from fire and ſhipwreck, was, upon a medium, 15 years; would this be

be concluſive with reſpect to the duration of any number of ſhips, which we might know from good authority to have met with no ſuch accident? In like manner, where the crown deſcends regularly from father to ſon, we have nothing to do with a rule, which pre-ſuppoſes an interrupted ſucceſſion. Our buſineſs here is to calculate by generations, where the error, we may confidently ſay, cannot be great; whereas in calculating unknown time by reigns, there is no poſſibility of gueſſing what it may be. If we had no hiſtory of the Roman emperors from CÆSAR to CONSTANTINE, and were

were reduced to the neceſſity of calculating by Sir ISAAC's average, how extravagantly would it miſlead us? For the number of reigns being 44, reckoning the emperors who reigned together only as one, this multiplied by 18, which is Sir ISAAC's loweſt average, would give 792 for the number of years, whereas in fact they were only 373.

Let us now ſee, how the calculation by generations will ſuit with the above-mentioned period of 263 years. According to PAUSANIAS *, the generations of the *Eurysthenidæ*, from the ſe-

* Lacon. p. 210. 214.

cond

cond year of the ninth Olympiad, were ſeven in number, excluſive of ALCAMENES, who is the head of the liſt; 1. POLYDORUS. 2. EURYCRATES. 3. ANAXANDER. 4. EURYCRATES the Second. 5. LEON. 6. ANAXANDRIDES. 7. LEONIDAS. Thoſe of the *Proclidæ*, excluding in like manner THEOPOMPUS, were, according to the ſame author *, 1. ARCHIDAMUS, who dying before his father, never reigned. 2. ZEUXIDAMUS. 3. ANAXIDAMUS. 4. ARCHIDAMUS. 5. AGASICLES. 6. ARISTO. 7. DEMARATUS, who, though depoſed, was ſtill living, and accom-

* Lacon. p. 220, 1.

panied XERXES on his expedition. Divide 263 years by 7, and the quotient is 37, with a remainder of 4, which makes 37 years and a half for each generation. This, though rather more than is commonly allowed, is greatly within the limits of poſſibility; and therefore the exceſs, even if there were no way of accounting for it, would not furniſh any concluſive argument againſt the authenticity of a public record.

But I muſt obſerve, that the cauſe of this irregularity, is to be found in the hiſtory itſelf. ANAXANDRIDES, the ſixth in our liſt of the EURYSTHENIDÆ, was

ſo

ſo long without children by his firſt wife, that, according to PAUSANIAS * and HERODOTUS †, he was compelled by the *Ephori* to take another, for fear the race of EURYSTHENES ſhould be extinct. This ſecond wife brought him CLEOMENES, his immediate ſucceſſor; after which he had three ſons, DORIEUS, and LEONIDAS, and CLEOMBROTUS, by his firſt. LEONIDAS therefore was born when his father was advanced towards the latter part of the generative period. It was alſo late in life before LEONIDAS ſucceeded to the throne; for his

* Lacon. p. 211.
† L. v. c. 39, 40.

half-brother CLEOMENES, who was advanced to it before him, did not become King till his brother DORIEUS was of an age to command a fleet and army, and to ſettle a colony. CLEOMENES reigned upwards of twenty years; ſo that LEONIDAS, at the time of his acceſſion, was probably near forty; and this being twelve years before the expedition of XERXES, LEONIDAS at the time of that event may be conſidered as a man of about two and fifty.

A ſimilar accident happened about the ſame time in the family of the *Proclidæ*. ARISTO, the

the ſixth in our liſt, had, according to HERODOTUS *, married two wives; but, ſtill continuing childleſs, was deſirous of marrying a third; and caſt his eyes upon the wife of his friend AGETUS, who, having been betrayed into an oath not to withhold any thing in his poſſeſſion from the king, ſurrendered her to him with reluctance. By this third wife he had DEMARATUS, who at the time of the invaſion of Attica by the Spartans, in ſupport of the faction of ISAGORAS †, was old enough to be joined in command

* L. VI. c. 62, 63.
† Herod. V. c. 74, 5.

with CLEOMENES, and therefore was probably not leſs than fifty years of age, when XERXES, near thirty years after, invaded Greece.

We have here two kings of Sparta, neither of them born in the firſt youth of his father, and both of them declining in life at the celebrated epocha of the battle of Thermopylæ. Taking theſe circumſtances together, we may fairly, I think, add an eighth, or nearly an eighth, generation to the ſeven, for which we have an inconteſtable warrant from hiſtory. And this being done, if we divide 263, which is the Olympic number of years, by

by 8, the quotient will be a little leſs than 33, and it will be half a year ſhort of Sir ISAAC's own allowance for a generation, which is between 33 and 34 years. Neither is this allowance greatly too much for the duration of the reigns of Kings, where the ſucceſſion follows the eldeſt ſon; for if we examine the genealogies from WILLIAM the Conqueror to his preſent majeſty, we ſhall find them to be three and twenty in number, excluding, as we ought, either the firſt of theſe Kings or the laſt; and then, if we divide 713, which is the number of years between 1066, the year of the Conqueſt, and

the year 1779, by 23, we ſhall find the quotient to be exactly 31. And though the line of genealogy goes in two inſtances through a younger ſon, that is, through HENRY the Firſt, and JOHN of Gaunt, duke of Lancaſter, which of courſe adds ſomething to the length of thoſe generations: yet in two others it paſſes through a ſiſter elder than the male heir, that is, through MARGARET daughter of HENRY VII. and the queen of Bohemia, daughter of James I. ſo that what is gained by one aberration is loſt by the other.

If it be thought probable, that kings in particular ſhould marry and

and have heirs before the age of 33: I answer in the first place, that both HESIOD and SOLON, almost the only writers from whom we can learn the customs of that age, both these, I say, have fixed upon thirty, as the seasonable age for marrying. The words of HESIOD have been often quoted *:

Μήτε τριηκόντων ἐτέων μάλα πολλ' ἀπολείπων,
Μήτ' επιβὰς μάλα πολλά.

Those of SOLON are still more appositе. Having divided human life into stages of seven years each; he speaks thus of the fifth †:

* Ἐργ. v. 696.
† Ap. Clem. Alexand. Strom. L. vi. p. 686.

Πέμπτη

Πέμπῃ δ' ὥριον ἄνδρα γάμε μεμνημένον ἔναι.

But ſecondly; though kings ſhould be ſuppoſed to marry earlier, ſome allowance ſhould be made for their wives not being pregnant immediately; or for the firſt children being daughters; or, if males, for their dying as a great proportion of infants does before they are paſt their childhood.

So much for the argument drawn from the uſual time that kings, upon an average, may be ſuppoſed to reign. I come now to conſider a few ſcattered paſ-

paſſages of the ancient Greek writers, which have been thought to contradict and overthrow the Olympic Chronology.

And firſt, we are told by PLATO *, that the laws of LYCURGUS had been then eſtabliſhed a little more than three hundred years; ἔτη τριακόσια καὶ ὀλίγῳ πλείω. Here if the reading be right, and the author well informed, the argument is concluſive. But as the change of a letter or two frequently makes a great change in the ſenſe, the firſt queſtion to be conſidered is the correctneſs of the text, and whether it can

* In Minoe, p. 567. Ed. F.

be ſo far depended upon, as to overſet the concurrent teſtimony of all antiquity. It would be no great alteration to read ἔτη τετρακόσια inſtead of τριακόσια, and ſuch a miſtake might be accounted for ſeveral ways; either from the firſt ſyllable of τετρακόσια being obliterated, or elſe thoſe two letters τ, ε, might be dropt, from their ſimilarity to the laſt ſyllable of ἔτη; after which the ſubſtitution of τριακόσια for τρακόσια might very eaſily happen. Admitting τετρακοσια to be the true reading, it will ſufficiently quadrate with the Olympic Chronology. SOCRATES is ſuppoſed to have been born in the

the third year of Olym. LXXVII. that is 307 years after the firſt Olympiad. Add to this 50 years for the age of SOCRATES, at the time when this converſation happened. This makes the number 357. Concerning the time when LYCURGUS flouriſhed there were ſeveral opinions; ſome making him coæval with the firſt Olympiad; others, according to PLUTARCH *, ſetting him many years before it; and others, I preſume, at other intervening periods. Now as we are quite in the dark which of theſe opinions PLATO followed, we are at full liberty to chuſe that, to

* Vit. Lycurg. init.

which

which the expreſſion of ἔτη τετρακόσια καὶ ὀλίγῳ πλείω will moſt perfectly agree.

Secondly, THUCYDIDES, according to Sir ISAAC NEWTON *, affirms, that "from the time "the Lacedæmonians had uſed "one and the ſame adminiſtra- "tion of their commonwealth "to the end of the Peloponne- "ſian war, there were *three hun-* "*dred years* and a few more." This difficulty, ſuppoſing the quotation exact, would be of leſs conſequence than the preceding; for it might be got over without any alteration of the

* Chronol. p. 57.

text.

text. By the words *one and the ſame adminiſtration of the commonwealth* the Hiſtorian might mean, not the laws of LYCURGUS, but the new form, which the government aſſumed in the reign of THEOPOMPUS, by the inſtitution of the *Ephori*; an event which we may ſuppoſe to have happened in the laſt year of Olymp. XI. exactly in the middle of his reign. From this year to the taking of Athens by LYSANDER, there is an interval of 82 Olympiads and one year, that is, of 329 years; to which ſpace the expreſſion of THUCYDIDES might naturally and without violence be applied. But in fact THUCYDIDES does not ſay what Sir ISAAC im-

imputes to him. The word in all the known copies of the original text * is τετρακόσια, *four hundred*, for which *three hundred* has been ſubſtituted in the old Latin tranſlation, where only it is to be found. This larger number, it is obvious, muſt be applied to the laws of LYCURGUS, and there can be no difficulty in applying it, as THUCYDIDES has no where told us, what interval he placed between LYCURGUS and the firſt Oympiad.

I ſhall not at preſent examine the objection which Sir ISAAC makes † to the Græcian Chro-

* L. 1. c. 18. Ed. Duker.
† Chronol. p. 55.

nology,

nology, from the *Lacedæmonian* (not *Meſſenian* *) army having been commanded in the ſecond year of Olymp. X. by one EURYLEON, the ſixth in deſcent from THERAS, who lived during the invaſion of the *Heraclidæ*, becauſe this objection principally affects the time preceding the Olympiads; whereas the preſent matter of diſcuſſion is the genuineneſs of the Olympiads themſelves. I proceed therefore to an objection of much more importance, which affects the Olympiads only; and, if ſubſtantially ſupported, would go a great way towards overthrowing

* Pauſan. Meſſen. p. 296.

their credit. HERODOTUS, in his liſt of the noble youths, who ſollicited the daughter of CLISTHENES in marriage, mentions one LEOCEDES, the ſon of PHIDON. His words are *, ἀπὸ δὲ Πελοποννήσε Φείδωνος τῦ Ἀργείων τυράννε παῖς Λεωκήδης, Φείδωνος δὲ τῦ τὰ μέτρα ποιήσαντος Πελοποννησίοισι, κ) ὑβρίσαντος μέγισα δὴ Ἑλλήνων ἁπάντων· ὃς ἐξανασήσας τὲς Ἠλείων ἀγωνοθέτας αὐτὸς τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε. The words, as they ſtand, can mean nothing but that LEOCEDES was the ſon of PHIDON, the tyrant of Argos, and the ſame PHIDON, who eſtabliſhed the Peloponneſian weights and mea-

* Lib. VI. c. 127.

ſures; who was guilty of greater exceſſes than any other of the Greeks, and having ejected the *Agonothetæ* of the Eleans preſided himſelf at the Olympic Games. The time of the PHIDON, who uſurped this office, is fixed by PAUSANIAS to the eighth Olympiad *; and with him STRABO † in effect agrees, by making PHIDON the tenth in deſcent from TEMENUS. The Arundel Marble indeed ſpeaks of one PHIDON an ARGIVE, who coined money 415 years before the expedition of XERXES ‡; that is 119 years before the firſt Olympiad. But

* Eliac. II. p. 509.
† Lib. VIII. p. 549.
‡ Marm. Oxon. I. l. 45.

as nothing is ſaid of his tyranny or invaſion of his neighbours, it is poſſible that in the Marble, as well as in Herodotus, he may have been confounded with PHIDON of Corinth, a very ancient Lawgiver mentioned by ARISTOTLE *. Or even if the ſame PHIDON be meant, the miſtake is not greater than ſome others which have been found in that famous Chronology. Be this as it may, my argument is not at all benefited by following the computation of PAUSANIAS and STRABO, rather than that of the Marble; becauſe in either caſe, if it ſhould clearly appear, that

* Politic. II. p. 35. Ed. Sylburg.

LEO-

LEOCEDES, the ſon of this PHIDON, courted the daughter of CLISTHENES, it will equally prove the incorrectneſs of the Olympic liſt, or rather indeed the non-exiſtence of a great part of the Olympiads. Sir ISAAC very juſtly places CLISTHENES in the 47th Olympiad, and his daughter being courted by the ſon of PHIDON, it follows that he and PHIDON were nearly equal in age. Now PHIDON is ſaid to have lived in the eighth Olympiad, and CLISTHENES 154 years later, in the 47th. The conſequence evidently is, if they were really contemporaries, that the Olympiads muſt have been ex-

tended near 140 years beyond the truth.

The attentive reader will obſerve, that the whole of this argument reſts upon one ſingle paſſage in HERODOTUS, and conſequently falls to the ground, if that paſſage ſhould happen to have been incorrectly tranſcribed; if it has been interpolated or mutilated, ſo as to alter the ſenſe. Now the perfect correctneſs of any one paſſage, conſidering the many corruptions to which books are liable, is a thing too uncertain to be relied upon, in oppoſition to the weight of evidence in favour of the Olympic Chronology,

nology. In this very paſſage, two of the manuſcripts omit the important word παῖς, which leaves room for ſuppoſing that LEOCEDES might be only the deſcendent of PHIDON. But for my own part I am inclined to believe, that the word παῖς is genuine, and no interpolation; though I think that the paſſage is evidently corrupted. The adverſative particle δὲ comes in very aukwardly and improperly in the ſecond part of the ſentence, ſuppoſing the writer to ſpeak of the ſame PHIDON in both places; and if we ſtrike it out, the repetition of the word Φείδωνος has a poetical air, very unſuitable to hiſtory.

I would read therefore *Φείδωνος τῦ Ἀργείων τυράννυ παῖς Λεωκήδης, Φείδωνος δὲ ΟΥ τῦ τὰ μέτρα ποιήσαντος, κ. τ. λ.* In Engliſh: "Leo-
" cedes the ſon of Phidon, king
" of Argos; but *not* of that Phi-
" don who eſtabliſhed the Pelo-
" ponneſian meaſures," and ſo forth. This correction ſuppoſes that Phidon, the father of Leocedes, though ſeveral generations later than the enterprizing Phidon, ſtill poſſeſſed the ſovereignty of Argos: the probability of which it may be neceſſary to eſtabliſh, it not being generally known, that Argos continued to be a monarchical ſtate ſo long. What Sir Isaac

Newton

NEWTON aſſerts *, that "between CISUS (the ſon of TEMENUS) and PHIDON they reigned not," is a miſtake, ariſing from his underſtanding the words of PAUSANIAS in too ſtrong a ſenſe. That learned antiquary ſays †, that the Argives, being from the moſt ancient times lovers of equality and independence, reduced the power of the kings ſo low—ὡς μηδένι τῶν Κίσου ἢ τοῖς ἀπογόνοις ἢ τὸ ὄνομα λειφθῆναι τῆς βασιλείας μόνον—"*that nothing but the name of royalty was left to the deſcendents of* CISUS." The paſſage in the Greek is intricate and

* Chronol. p. 123.
† Corinth. p. 152.

cor-

corrupt; nor will it be much mended by reading ὡς ΜΗΔΕΝ μηδένι τῶν κείσε — which would signify, "*ſo that nothing was left to any of the deſcendents of* CISUS *and to his deſcendents, but the name only of royalty.*" PAUSANIAS, in the following ſentence, mentions one MEDON, from whom the laſt king of Argos was deſcended; and SATYRUS, an ancient hiſtorian, quoted by THEOPHILUS, biſhop of Antioch *, ſpeaks of MARON as the ſon and immediate ſucceſſor of CISUS. I would read therefore — ὡς μήδεν ΜΗΔΩΝΙ τῷ Κείσε, ἢ τοῖς ἀπογόνοις, ἢ τὸ ὄνομα λειφθῆναι τῆς βασιλείας

* Ad Autolycum. l. II. p. 96. Ed. Wolf.

μόνον

μόνον—"*ſo that nothing was left to* MEDON, *the ſon of* CISUS, *and his deſcendents, but the name only of royalty.*" It is plain from this paſſage alone, that the lineal deſcendents of CISUS, the ſon of TEMENUS, continued to be kings of Argos for ſome time; and ARISTOTLE, in his Politicks *, expreſsly ſays, that PHIDON the Argive *of a King became a Tyrant*; ſo that the kingdom was his by inheritance. But neither was PHIDON the laſt to whom it went in ſucceſſion. For PAUSANIAS, in the ſentence immediately following, ſays, "that the people [of Argos] being diſ-

* L. V. p. 152. Ed. Sylburg.

affected

affected to MELTAS, the ſon of LACIDES, and deſcendent of MEDON, deprived him of the government entirely. The kingdom of Argos therefore was poſſeſſed, as an hereditary, though limited, monarchy, by the ſon of LACIDES; a word, which, when corrected to LACEDES, as LEOCIDES in HERODOTUS has been to LEOCEDES, turns out to be the ſame name, differing no otherwiſe than as Μενελεως does from Μενελαος, or LEODAMAS from LAODAMAS. DEMOCEDES, a name repeatedly mentioned in HERODOTUS, is a word of the ſame import. Upon the whole then it ſeems highly probable, that the

the LEOCIDES, or LEOCEDES, of HERODOTUS, was ſon to the king of Argos, whatever the name of his father was. I ſuppoſe it to have been PHIDON, who being an obſcure perſon, compared with his anceſtor the invader of Elis, it became neceſſary for HERODOTUS to caution his readers againſt confounding one with the other. If the conjecture here propoſed, to which I foreſee no material objection, be admitted, it entirely removes the Chronological difficulty inſiſted upon by Sir ISAAC NEWTON.

A fourth objection to the Olympic Chronology is taken

from a paſſage in PAUSANIAS *, where he is ſuppoſed to ſay, "that CYPSELUS, king of Corinth, was the ſixth in deſcent from MELAS, the contemporary of ALETES, who got poſſeſſion of Corinth when the *Heraclidæ* returned into Peloponneſus †. The reign of CYPSELUS began in the 30th or 31ſt Olympiad; and by this reckoning MELAS muſt have lived only two generations before the firſt Olympiad; whereas his contemporary ALETES was alſo contemporary with TEMENUS ‡, ſeven or eight generations older than that Period. Admitting there-

* Eliac I. p. 424.
† Chronol. p. 62.
‡ Strabo, L. VIII. p. 597.

fore

fore CYPSELUS to have been only the ſixth from MELAS, we muſt annihilate about five generations, which are nearly equal to one and forty Olympiads, of the interval between them. But the ſame PAUSANIAS, from whom this is quoted, tells us in another place*, that ALETES and his deſcendents reigned at Corinth for five generations, the laſt being BACCHIS, the ſon of PRUMNIS: that after him the ſo-called *Bacchiadæ* reigned there for five other generations, ending with TELESTES, the ſon of ARISTODEMUS, who was killed by ARIEUS and PERANTAS: after which

* Corinthiac. p. 120.

Corinth

Corinth was not governed by kings, but by annual magiſtrates of the race of the *Bacchiadæ*, till the time of their expulſion by CYPSELUS." This account of PAUSANIAS is clear and circumſtantial; and from it we learn, that there were at leaſt ten generations between the time of MELAS and CYPSELUS; and how many more we are not informed. The word ἕκτον therefore, in the paſſage of PAUSANIAS, quoted by Sir ISAAC, is indiſputably a corruption. It might be altered to ἑνδέκατον; but a careful examination of the context has convinced me, that the original word was not a word of

of number. The paſſage ſtands thus in the editions *: Κυψέλῳ ἢ τοῖς προγόνοις ἕκτον ἦν γένος ἐξαρχῆς Γονέσης τῆς Σικυῶνος, ἢ πρόγονος σφίσιν ἦν Μέλας ὁ Αντάσσε. If this paſſage admits of any ſenſe at all, it muſt be ſomething like the following: CYPSELUS *and his anceſtors were in the ſixth generation from* GONUSSA *of Sicyon, and their Progenitor was* MELAS *the ſon of* ANTASSUS. But this, as the reader muſt ſee, is full of abſurdities. GONUSSA is the name of a *place* in the country of Sicyon; and not, as Sir ISAAC imagined, of a *perſon*. It is moreover a palpable blunder to ſay,

* Pauſan. Eliac. I. p. 424.

that CYPSELUS, *and his anceſtors*, were in the ſixth generation from any body; for if he was in the ſixth, his father muſt have been in the fifth; and his grandfather in the fourth. It appears probable to me, that ΕΚΤΟΝ was formerly ΕΚ ΓΟΝ, and that Γονεσης does not occupy its proper place, but ſhould follow the præpoſition ἐκ, the whole ſtanding thus: Κυψέλῳ καὶ τοῖς προγόνοις ΕΚ ΓΟΝΟΥΣΣΗΣ ἦν γένος ἐξαρχῆς τῆς Σικυώνος, καὶ πρόγονος σφίσιν ἦν Μέλας ὁ Αντάσσε. "*The race of* CYPSELUS *and his* "*anceſtors was originally from* "Gonuſſa *in the country of* Si-"cyon, *and their progenitor was* "MELAS,

"MELAS, *the ſon of* ANTASSUS." This agrees exactly with what he ſays in another place *, that "MELAS, the ſon of ANTASSUS, came from GONUSSA beyond Sicyon, to ſerve in the Dorian army againſt Corinth, and that ALETES with difficulty was prevailed upon to receive him." The alteration which I have propoſed may ſeem bold; but, I hope, it is not extravagantly ſo. They who are acquainted with MSS know, how common it is for a word, or part of a word, to be obliterated at the beginning or end of a line. Suppoſing this to have happened to the latter part of the word

* Corinthiac. p. 120.

Γονεσσης, the text would ſtand εκ Γον. Then comes a corrector, and puts the word Γονεσσης in the margin, which the next tranſcriber inſerts in an improper place, changing EK ΓON at the ſame time into EKTON.

I cannot diſmiſs this argument without obſerving, that Sir Isaac, who would here make Aletes only *ſix* generations older than Cypselus, and has urged this as a fact that overturns the common Chronology; yet himſelf, in another place *, reckons up by name the ſucceſſors and lineal deſcendents of Aletes to the num-

* Chronol. p. 142.

ber

ber of *eight*, and adds to them 42 annual Archons, all intervening between ALETES and CYPSELUS. So little are the beſt and wiſeſt of men upon their guard, when they have a favourite opinion to ſupport.

I now proceed in the fifth place to conſider the difficulty ſuggeſted by the age of TERPANDER, the famous muſician. "*Athenæus*," to uſe the words of Sir ISAAC *, "tells us out of ancient "authors (*Hellanicus*, *Soſimus*, "and *Hieronymus*) that *Lycur-* "*gus* the Legiſlator was contem- "porary to *Terpander* the mu-

* Chronol. p. 58.

" ſician, and that *Terpander* was " the firſt man who got the vic- " tory in the *Carnea*, in a ſo- " lemnity of muſic inſtituted in " thoſe feſtivals in the 26th " Olympiad." The inference is plain, that if LYCURGUS lived till the 26th Olympiad, the preceding Olympiads muſt be fictitious. But here I muſt take the liberty to ſay, that the words of Sir ISAAC convey a falſe idea, much too favourable to his ſyſtem. The natural meaning of them is, that there are three ancient hiſtorians, who expreſsly give teſtimony againſt the common notion of LYCURGUS having lived a hundred years prior to the firſt Olympiad;

piad; and inſtead of that bring him a hundred years below it. But the fact is, that not one of theſe ancient authors ſays either that, or any thing like it. The words of Athenæus literally tranſlated, run thus *. "That TERPANDER was older than ANACREON is plain from the following teſtimonies. TERPANDER was the firſt who obtained "the prize in the *Carnea*, as "HELLANICUS relates, both in "his metrical and proſe account "of the *Carneonicæ*. Now the "inſtitution of the *Carnea* was "in the 26th Olympiad, as *Soſimus* affirms in his Chronolo-

* L. XIV. p. 635.

" gy. But HIERONYMUS, in his " book upon *Citharoedi*, which " is the fifth of his work upon " *Poets*, ſays, that TERPANDER " lived in the time of LYCURGUS " the Lawgiver, whom all wri- " ters unanimouſly allow to have " aſſiſted IPHITUS the Elean in " that inſtitution of the Olympic " games, which is reckoned the " firſt." We ſee here three different writers, atteſting three ſeparate unconnected facts, plainly conſidered by ATHENÆUS as contradictory one to another, but which muſt be all brought together, and all ſuppoſed to be true, before Sir ISAAC's concluſion can be made out from them.

This

This ſurely is very different from having each of the three witneſſes ſpeak to all the three facts. Even HIERONYMUS, the only one of them who brings LYCURGUS and TERPANDER together, agreed with all other writers, I ſuppoſe, (ſince all writers, according to ATHENÆUS, were agreed) that LYCURGUS lived at the time of the firſt inſtitution of the Olympiads by IPHITUS, and therefore, had Hieronymus known the aſſertions of the other two, he would certainly have rejected one or other of them. So that here we have a point made out, it ſeems, not by three unanimous witneſſes in the common way; but by three who

who contradict and refute one another.

What ground Hieronymus might have for his singular notion, that LYCURGUS and TERPANDER were contemporaries, it is impossible (ATHENÆUS having said nothing) to conjecture. But singular it certainly was; for PLUTARCH, in the Book *de Musica* *, where he enquires very minutely into the age of TERPANDER, does not give the least hint of any such opinion having been started. He appears to have placed him nearly where the Arundel Marble places him, a

* Moral. p. 1132.

little

little before ARCHILOCHUS; though the ſtory which he tells, of his carrying away the prize four times ſucceſſively at the Pythian Games is not conſiſtent with that marble: unleſs we ſuppoſe him to mean Pythian Games, celebrated at irregular intervals, in ſome period prior to their final eſtabliſhment *.

The ſame LYCURGUS furniſhes Sir ISAAC with a ſixth objection to the Olympic Chronology †, which it is much eaſier to anſwer, than to preſerve in anſwering the temper and decorum due

* Compare alſo Clem. Alex. Lib. I. p. 333. Ed. Par.

† Chronol. p. 58.

to

to so high a character. It seems there was a Disc at Olympia, which had the name of LYCURGUS inscribed upon it. Hence ARISTOTLE, according to PLUTARCH *, inferred, that LYCURGUS was contemporary with Iphitus, the founder of the Olympic Games, and assisted in the establishment of them. Sir ISAAC taking it for granted that this Disc was one of those used by the Athletes, finding that the Disc was a part of the *Pentathlos*, and having learnt from PAUSANIAS †, that from the time the Olympiads were celebrated in a regular series, the *Pentathlos* was

* V. Lycurg, p. 85. Ed. Bryan.
† Eliac. I. p. 394.

never

never practiſed till the 18th of thoſe Olympiads, he concludes, that it was at this very time LYCURGUS was preſent, and conſequently that his age has been ſet near 140 years too high by the Chronologers. The concluſion is much too haſty, even though the premiſes had been true. I need not inform the reader, that the invention and cuſtom of caſting the Diſc, as a trial of ſkill, was older than LYCURGUS, being mentioned by HOMER. And though HOMER himſelf, partaking of the common fate of his countrymen, loſes ſomewhat of his antiquity in the hands of Sir ISAAC, he is ſtill admitted to have

been prior to LYCURGUS. Now the game of the Diſc being confeſſedly older than the *Pentathlos*, what abſurdity is there in ſuppoſing that it might be ſeparately practiſed at the Olympic Feſtival, as PINDAR expreſsly affirms it was in ſome places *, before it was combined with other exerciſes to make the *Pentathlos?* It is only in organized productions, whether animal or vegetable, that a part cannot exiſt before the whole, but in civil inſtitutions nothing is more common. And when it is ſuppoſed, that the Game of the Diſc could not exiſt before the *Quinquertium*, it might

* Iſthm. I.

with

with equal juſtice be ſaid, that the union of any two unconnected offices in the ſame perſon is a proof, that neither of them at any former period had been ſeparately exerciſed.

This would be a ſufficient anſwer. But the reader will be ſurprized to hear, that the fact is, not what Sir ISAAC has ſtated it to be, but exactly the reverſe. PAUSANIAS does not ſay, that the *Pentathlos*, or combination of the Diſc, with four other Games, was firſt practiſed, or inſtituted in the 18th Olympiad. His account is to this effect *. "After

* Eliac. I. p. 394.

"IPHITUS

" IPHITUS had revived the feſti-
" val in the manner above re-
" lated, the memory of many
" antient cuſtoms was ſtill loſt,
" and it was by ſlow degrees that
" men came to the remembrance
" of them, and added to the
" Games whatever they happened
" to recollect. This is manifeſt.
" For reckoning from the time
" when the memorials of the
" Olympiads go on without in-
" terruption, the firſt prize given
" was for the foot-race, which
" was won by COROEBUS the Ele-
" an. Afterwards in the four-
" teenth Olympiad the *Diaulos*
" was added, and HYPENUS of
" Piſa carried away the olive-
" branch

" branch for the *Diaulos*, as " ACANTHUS did in the next " Olympiad. Then in the 18th " Olympiad they recollected the " *Pentathlos* and the wreſtling." The *Pentathlos* therefore was no new invention of that time, but the very words of PAUSANIAS ſhew, that it had been practiſed long before the revival of the Olympic games by IPHITUS, ſo long indeed as to have gone into diſuſe and oblivion. And hence it follows, not only that the Diſc and *Pentathlos* might be as old as the time at which LYCURGUS is commonly placed; but, if Sir ISAAC's inference be juſt, that the Diſc was given by LY-

CURGUS, at the firſt inſtitution of the *Pentathlos*, it will lead alſo to another very unexpected concluſion, that LYCURGUS himſelf muſt have lived a generation or two before the firſt Olympiad.

But what if the Diſc of LYCURGUS, after all, ſhould have no relation to the *Pentathlos*, or to the Diſc thrown by the Athletes? PAUSANIAS informs us *, that there was preſerved at Elis a Diſc of IPHITUS, on which was inſcribed the armiſtice proclaimed by the Eleans, the inſcription being not in a ſtrait line, but running circularly round the

* Eliac. I. p. 427.

Diſc.

Diſc. Mr. JOHN JACKSON, in his Chronology, conjectures with great probability, that this was the Diſc alluded to by PLUTARCH *; and his opinion ſeems to be confirmed by the inference that ARISTOTLE drew from it, which was, not that LYCURGUS was the companion of IPHITUS in reſtoring the Olympic Games, as Sir ISAAC ſurmiſes, but that he aſſiſted in ſettling the armiſtice.

The laſt argument of Sir ISAAC againſt the Olympic Chronology is taken from the liſt of the Macedonian kings: and this indeed his manner of ſtating it has ren-

* See before, p. 204.

dered rather ſtrong. The interval of time which theſe kings are to fill up terminates in two epochas, one undiſputed and certain, the expedition of XERXES; the other much leſs determinate, the reign of PHIDON *, the king of Argos and invader of Elis. This invaſion, according to PAUSANIAS, who ſpeaks without any marks of doubt or heſitation, happened in the eighth Olympiad †; but the Arundel marble, if underſtood of the ſame PHIDON, carries him a full hundred years higher. The latter computation was evidently the moſt to Sir ISAAC NEWTON's purpoſe,

* See before, p. 179.
† Eliac. II. p. 509.

and

and therefore when he reaſons fluently from this, without taking any notice of the other, he certainly does full juſtice to his argument. In a matter of ſuch high antiquity, where moſt of the authors, who might have aſſiſted us, are loſt, I ſhould think that I had as good a right to follow the authority of PAUSANIAS, even if it were ſingle and unſupported, as Sir ISAAC has to follow the marble. But this is not the caſe. For STRABO, who was certainly well acquainted with the old Greek Hiſtorians, makes PHIDON the tenth from TEMENUS *, which exactly falls

* Lib. VIII. p. 549.

in with the reckoning of PAUSANIAS. PHIDON therefore being ſuppoſed to reign in the eighth Olympiad, the interval between the end of that Olympiad and the beginning of the 75th is exactly 264 years.

The number of Macedonian princes who are to fill up that interval, is a ſtill more diſputable point. HERODOTUS * makes ALEXANDER, the contemporary of XERXES, the ſeventh king from the beginning of the monarchy; and with this computation THUCYDIDES in effect agrees †. In the liſt given by HERODOTUS,

* Lib. VIII. c. 139.
† Lib. II. c. 100.

PER-

PERDICCAS ſtands firſt: which, I apprehend, is no further true than that PERDICCAS was the firſt who reigned under the title of King: which is preciſely what SOLINUS aſſerts *. But if we may believe other ancient authors, PERDICCAS was by no means the perſon, or contemporary with the perſon, who under the reign of PHIDON quitted Argos, and removed into Macedonia. This perſon, by every author but HERODOTUS, is called CARANUS, whom we learn from SYNCELLUS to have been the brother of PHIDON †. He is mentioned alſo by PLUTARCH ‡,

* Cap. IX.
† Syncell. Chron. p. 158. Ed. Venet.
‡ Vit. Alexand. p. 6.

PAUSANIAS *, and DIODORUS SICULUS †; by SATYRUS, an ancient author quoted by THEOPHILUS biſhop of Antioch ‡; and among the Latins by LIVY §, PATERCULUS ‖, JUSTIN **, and SOLINUS ††. Then follows another queſtion, whether any generations intervened between CARANUS and PERDICCAS. The liſt of the Macedonian Kings in SYNCELLUS ‡‡ inſerts two, by the names of COENUS and TYRIMMAS; and he alſo informs us,

* Boeot. p. 794.
† Ap. Syncell, p. 209.
‡ Ad Autolyc. II. p. 96. Ed. Wolf.
§ Dec. V. Lib. V.
‖ Lib. I.
** Lib. VII.
†† Cap IX.
‡‡ Chron. p. 209. Ed. Venet.

that

that COENUS was the ſon of CARANUS, and TYRIMMAS of COENUS. In other reſpects his liſt agrees exactly with that of HERODOTUS, which I hope will be no diminution of its authority. The above quoted SATYRUS alſo inſerts the ſame two names between CARANUS and PERDICCAS; though he differs from HERODOTUS and SYNCELLUS, by leaving out ARGÆUS, the ſon of PERDICCAS; whoſe exiſtence however is eſtabliſhed both by the authority of JUSTIN *, and by medals †. Theſe different omiſſions are eaſily accounted for from the negligence of tranſcribers in writing

* l. c. † Not. ad Herodot. l. c.

out

out a tedious genealogy. It would not be ſo eaſy to account for their inſerting a name without authority; becauſe this would not be negligence but invention. In the generations ſubſequent to PERDICCAS, we find ALCETAS, the father of AMYNTAS, omitted by JUSTIN. Yet there can be no doubt, I think, of his having been really the ſon of AEROPUS, and father of AMYNTAS, becauſe, as he is placed only three generations before HERODOTUS, it is hardly poſſible that he could have been inſerted by miſtake, and the other two liſts concur in retaining him.

There

There is upon the whole then indiſputable evidence, that CARANUS was the perſon who removed from Argos, and laid the firſt foundation of the Macedonian kingdom. There is alſo good authority for ſuppoſing that PERDICCAS, who completed the work of CARANUS, and firſt aſſumed the title of King, was not the *brother*, as Sir ISAAC from the ambiguous authority of HERODOTUS preſumes, but the *great grandſon* of CARANUS. The liſt and order of generations will therefore ſtand thus, preciſely as in SYNCELLUS: 1. CARANUS. 2. COENUS. 3. TYRIMMAS. 4. PER-

4. PERDICCAS. 5. ARGÆUS. 6. PHILIPPUS. 7. AEROPUS. 8. ALCETAS. 9. AMYNTAS. 10. ALEXANDER. Ten kings make nine generations, as it is always neceſſary to ſtrike off either the firſt or the laſt of the liſt. Divide then 264, the number of years between Phidon and the expedition of Xerxes, by 9, the number of generations, and the quotient will be 29, with a remainder of 3: that is, the portion of time for each generation will be exactly 29 years and 4 months; which is conſiderably leſs than Sir ISAAC himſelf allows. And I have already ſhewn at large, that if we calculate at all, it

it muſt be by generations, the number of kings furniſhing no ground whatever for rational argument.

And now having, I think, evinced the inſufficiency of Sir ISAAC's arguments to overthrow the Chronology of the Olympiads, I will, to ſhew my own fairneſs, produce two which he has overlooked. The Scholiaſt of PINDAR, in his Commentary on the ſecond and third Olympic Odes, gives us, as it ſhould ſeem, the genealogy of THERON, the contemporary of PINDAR. In the former place he begins it thus *: 1. LAIUS. 2. OEDIPUS.

* Schol. in Pindar, O. II. v. 82.

3. Po-

3. POLYNICES. 4. THERSANDER. 5. TISAMENUS. 6. ANTESION. 7. THERAS. 8. SAMUS. 9. TELEMACHUS, who removed from the iſland of Thera, and ſettled in Sicily. 10. CHALCIOPEUS. 11. ÆNESIDAMUS. 12. THERON. In the latter he gives only the immediate progenitors of Theron*: 1. TELEMACHUS, who depoſed the tyrant PHALARIS. 2. EMMENIDES. 3. ÆNESIDAMUS. 4. THERON. THERAS, the ſeventh in the firſt liſt, was contemporary with TEMENUS, the conqueror of Argos; from whom, according to this liſt, THERON would only be the fifth

* O. III. v. 68.

in

in deſcent. Now PINDAR, having been born in Olympiad LXV. we cannot ſuppoſe THERON, whom he celebrates, to have been born earlier than Olympiad LV. But from TEMENUS to the beginning only of the Olympiads were eight generations. So that if the Scholiaſt has given us the compleat genealogy, it will follow that there were no leſs than 55 fictitious Olympiads; which if any one is diſpoſed to believe, I will not be his hindrance.

A ſecond argument might be brought from PAUSANIAS, who tells us *, that PYTHAGORAS the

* Corinthiac. p. 140.

phi-

philoſopher was the great-grandſon of HIPPASUS, and that HIPPASUS was contemporary with REGNIDAS, the grandſon of TEMENUS. This makes a ſtill greater defalcation of time; and I ſhall therefore leave it in full force, that the advocates for this part of Sir ISAAC NEWTON's Syſtem of Chronology may diſpoſe of it as they pleaſe.

Before I conclude, I have one general remark to make upon Sir ISAAC's book; that he finds fault with the earlier part of the Græcian Hiſtory for having no Chronology; and yet ſuppoſes, that when Chronology, that is, technical

nical Chronology, was introduced by TIMÆUS and others, the only uſe made of it was to falſify their hiſtory. This makes it neceſſary to explain, in a few words, my notion what Chronology is, and what it is not. I ſay then, that the Genealogy of a particular family, a ſeries of kings or prieſteſſes, a liſt of archons, or the records of a public ſolemnity like the Olympic Games; none of theſe are Chronology. But Chronology is that ſcience, which compares thoſe liſts, genealogies, and records, together, and adjuſts them one to another; making, if poſſible, one conſiſtent whole. This is a

work that requires, no doubt, the hand of a maſter, and it requires alſo an unprejudiced mind. For if the chronologer has any favourite point to eſtabliſh, if, for inſtance, he is deſirous of extending or contracting any particular period, he will be tempted in his account of public tranſactions to imitate PROCRUSTES; to mutilate or ſtretch them out, as may beſt ſerve his purpoſe. I do not know that the antient chronologers were under any ſuch temptation; that there was any particular ſyſtem of hiſtory, which they were obliged at all events to make good; and therefore whatever errors

errors they may have committed, I preſume they were only errors of judgement. With reſpect to the genealogies and records, which preceded this technical chronology, they are ſtill further removed from any ſuſpicion of infidelity. The compilers of them purſued no ſyſtem, and therefore could be miſled by none. The want of Chronology therefore, with which Sir ISAAC reproaches the older Greeks, is a circumſtance which, in another point of view, may be conſidered as ſtrongly ſupporting their credit.

POSTSCRIPT.

IN writing p. 179 I overlooked a very material circumſtance, mentioned by PAUSANIAS *, and confirmed by STRABO †; which is, that the Eleans made no entry of the Olympiad at which PHIDON the Argive preſided. Now PAUSANIAS, having inſpected the record at Olympia, could not be miſinformed with reſpect to the particular Olympiad. And hence the age of PHIDON is fixed to a certainty. He could neither be ſo ancient as the marble makes him, nor ſo modern as he is ſuppoſed by Sir ISAAC NEWTON.

* Eliac. II. p. 509.
† L. VIII. p. 549.

The paſſage of STRABO proves alſo the truth of what I have aſſerted from PAUSANIAS *, that the account kept by the Eleans of the Olympic Games was in the nature of a record, and that it was kept from the time that the Olympiads are referred to numerically.

How perfect this record was, and how carefully PAUSANIAS had examined it, might be further proved by what he ſays of XENODAMUS of Anticyra, upon whoſe ſtatue there was an inſcription, importing, that he had

* See p. 124—128.

ob-

obtained a victory in the *Pancratium* at the Olympic Games. "If this inſcription be true," ſays he *, "it ſhould ſeem, that XENODAMUS obtained this prize in the 211th Olympiad. For this is the only Olympiad omitted in the regiſter of the Eleans." It is plain therefore, that PAUSANIAS had inſpected the regiſter from beginning to end, and that he had found it perfect in every inſtance but this. The reaſon of this particular Olympiad being omitted was probably on account of the irregular interference of NERO, who was preſent at it.

* Phocic. p. 892.

The

The correction of HERODOTUS propoſed in p. 184. is countenanced by a ſimilar paſſage of PAUSANIAS, Arcad. p. 631. Δῆλα ἔν ἐσι Χαλκώδοντα, ἀ τὸν ἐξ Εὐβοίας, καὶ Τελαμῶνα, ἀ τὸν Αἰγινήτην, ἐπὶ Ἡλείους Ἡρακλεῖ μετεσχηκέναι τῆς ςρατιᾶς.

THE END.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

JAN 3 1979

APR 1979

RECD LD-URL

OCT 1 3 1980

REC'D LD-URL

JUL 22 1987

MAY 07

APR 20

Form L9–Series 4939

University of California, Los Angeles
L 006 390 805 7

BL
780
M972t

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 192 052 9